WESTERN LUMINARY.

A Family Paper, devoted principally to Religious Matter;--with a copious summary of Foreign and Domestic News, Literary Intelligence, and Miscellaneous Articles.

Printed and Published Weekly, by Thomas T. Skillman.——Terms, $2 in advance—$2 50 at the end of six months--$3 00 at the end of the year.

Vol. IX.——No. 39. **LEXINGTON, KY. WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1833.** **Whole No. 455.**

From the Presbyterian.

Letters to Presbyterians

ON THE PRESENT CRISIS IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

LETTER VIII.

Adherence to our Doctrinal Standards.–Continued.

CHRISTIAN BRETHREN,—Before I take leave of the subject of adherence to our doctrinal standards allow me to advert to one or two points, closely connected with the general subject, in relation to which I cannot resist the impression that sentiments and practices of more than doubtful character have been repeatedly indulged in several of our judicatories. No one, I trust, will suspect me of a disposition so far to travel out of my province as to arraign and censure ecclesiastical bodies with which I have nothing immediately to do. Far from it. My only object is to remark on some *principles*, which, whenever they are assumed, and acted upon, cannot fail, in my opinion, to lead to mischief.

The first of the points to which I refer, is one which appears to me to have a very portentous bearing on the doctrinal purity and peace of our church. I mean the disposition which has been avowed and acted upon, of forming new Presbyteries upon the plan of what has been called "elective affinity;"—or, in other words, where there is a large Presbytery, comprising brethren who differ very materially in their doctrinal belief, and who find it difficult to act with harmony together, on account of that difference, of forming the members who constitute one of the parties into a new Presbytery, by themselves, thus enabling them to indulge their doctrinal peculiarities, and to pursue their favorite policy without control. In the remarks which I have to offer on this subject, I beg to be considered as having no special reference to the act of the last General Assembly, by which a certain Presbytery seems to have been confessedly divided upon this very principle. If I had been a member of that assembly, I am inclined to think I should have given my vote for the division which was made; not, however, by any means on the principle which was avowed by many of the advocates of the measure; but on an entirely different ground, hereafter to be stated. My sole object is, without any reference to particular cases, to offer some general remarks by which I hope you will be satisfied, that the whole scheme of forming new Presbyteries on the principle of "elective affinity," involves an essential departure from the spirit of our constitution; and, if freely pursued, must very speedily issue in a painful and fatal division of the Presbyterian Church.

The theory of our ecclesiastical constitution, as every one who reflects on the subject, will immediately perceive, is, that the Presbyterian Church, though composed of many parts, is ONE BODY. It supposes a number of individual churches and judicatories all embracing the same faith; walking by the same rules; and agreeing to be governed by the same principles of truth and order; thus forming one harmonious community, in which every part is presumed to agree with every other part, and one law, spirit and counsel to pervade the whole. "Things equal to one and the same thing are equal to one another." Of course, if every minister, and elder, and deacon of the Presbyterian Church, on becoming such, subscribes a certain formulary, the whole body is to be considered as according with that formulary, which each individual part has formally adopted; and, consequently, every part is in harmony with every other part. In this sense, the Presbyterian Church, in a manner somewhat peculiar to herself, is ONE: not merely composed of a number of religious bodies, or worshipping assemblies, bearing the same *name*, and a *general resemblance* to each other;—but every member and judicatory being integral parts of the same compact and organized body, and each part exercising its appropriate and definite share of government, over itself, and over the whole.

This is the theory. Now it is evident that if there be not real harmony, real unity of spirit among all these several parts, the principle on which the body is constituted, is, precisely to the extent to which this want of harmony exists, really abandoned. If even a single subordinate part, or judicatory does not believe, and refuses to act, in accordance with the rest, it is plain that the beauty, the purity, and even the safety of the whole may be invaded by that one. And if a few more parts become erratic and impure, their influence may soon become, not merely unhappy, but fatal. This principle is not so applicable to various other denominations. If a single Independent or Congregational Church, or even a single Congregational Association, should depart from the general faith or order which it has been wont to receive, it would, of course, be regretted by the wise and the good. But as that church, or that association is an independent and insulated body; has only an *advisory* power, and can take no part in *governing* the rest of her sisters; the mischief of her aberration might by no means be widely extended; at any rate the mischief attendant upon it might not be *necessarily* great.

But suppose the case to be, as it actually is, and must be, when a similar occurrence takes place in the Presbyterian Church. Suppose a Presbytery to be set off on the principle of "elective affinity;" that is, on the principle, that the members who compose it, were not able to agree with their brethren in doctrinal sentiments; suppose that they differed so widely in this respect, not only from their brethren, but also from some very material articles in the Confession of Faith, as to be no longer able to act together with comfort and peace; and suppose that they wished for a separate organization that they might be free to indulge their doctrinal peculiarities in licensing and ordaining candidates, &c., without restraint or conflict. This may appear, to superficial thinkers, a very reasonable demand, and a very feasible expedient for terminating the evils of ecclesiastical controversy. But let us, for a moment, pursue this expedient to its natural results. Suppose this newly organized Presbytery to follow out the principles of its solicited, and eventually granted organization, into a regular system of corresponding acts. Suppose it immediately to go to work, and to be a kind of *mint*, for manufacturing and sending forth among the churches an abundance of coin bearing the same stamp with itself. Suppose, further, that the principle recently contended for be also adopted and acted upon, viz. that whenever either a licentiate or an ordained minister comes from any Presbytery with regular testimonials, declaring him to be in good standing with that body, he must, *of course*, be received by any and every other Presbytery to which he may present himself without a word of examination or inquiry; suppose these things, and is it not manifest, that it would be in the power of a single Presbytery of this character, in a few years, to ruin the Presbyterian Church? Let such a Presbytery be regarded by the public generally as the centre and patron of lax theology. Let it be understood that its members, though not all or perhaps *any* of them, Pelagians themselves, will not hesitate a moment to license or ordain a Pelagian! Let every individual in the land who dislikes the rigid plan of subscription to the Confession of Faith, and who wishes for the privilege of declaring his solemn assent to a system of doctrines without believing them—flock to that Presbytery for license and ordination. Let a score of candidates from that mint be emitted into the Church every year, and by certificates be distributed about among the more orthodox Presbyterians, as inclination or policy might dictate; and let the doctrine be adopted that no Presbytery must hesitate about receiving such candidates as come with "clean papers," whatever degree of painful suspicion respecting their soundness in the faith may be entertained:—let this course be pursued, and it is plain that no long time would be requisite to inoculate the whole church with the views of this single Presbytery; and that all faithful adherence to our public formularies would be at an end. I do not say, for I do not believe, that there is a single Presbytery in our Church which is *now* capable of acting in this manner. But a supposition has been made for the purpose of showing the natural tendency, and indeed the unavoidable operation, of the general principle of setting off new Presbyteries on the ground of incompatibility of doctrinal belief. And if I do not deceive myself, it is clearly and directly adapted to destroy the purity of the whole body.

There *is* an incompatibility, indeed, which I can readily recognize as a valid reason for dividing a Presbytery, and erecting a new one with a part of its members. I mean such an *incompatibility of temper:* such an *alienation of feeling* among the members as renders it difficult, if not impossible for them to transact the business of the church with mutual confidence and affection. For this reason, that is, on account of an evident incompatibility of feeling which rendered it wholly impossible for the members to act together with edification—as well as on account of the extraordinary and unwieldly size of the Presbytery which was divided by the last General Assembly, I think I should have concurred in the general measure of division, if it had been my lot to give a vote on that occasion. There was evidently a *state of feeling* in the body, which, as it respected *some* of the members, at least, had no immediate connexion with doctrinal discrepance. To divide them into two distinct bodies for the purpose of affording relief from this unhappy state of feeling—was in my apprehension no way inconsistent with correct and safe principle; and really seemed to be the only mode of affording the necessary relief. But to divide and erect new Presbyteries on the ground of the existence of such DOCTRINAL DIVERSITY as that brethren cannot live and act together;—is, in my opinion high treason against the first principles of Presbyterianism;—it is to poison the very fountains of our ecclesiastical purity; and, for the sake of avoiding a little present inconvenience, to lay a train for an explosion which must, at no great distance of time, rend the church in pieces. I contemplate the subject, my Christian brethren, I repeat, not at all with feelings excited by the case which occupied so much of the time and attention of the last Assembly. Of these I have none; having before intimated, that, if I had been a member of the body, I should probably have yielded my assent to the general measure which was adopted. But upon the most impartial and dispassionate view that I am able to take of the essential characteristic of a Presbyterian Church, as made up of many members, all subject to the same rules, and bound together in truth, love and authority by one common Head;—the idea of *expressly providing for the encouragement and perpetuation of diversity of faith in her bosom,* is deliberately to conspire against her unity, and to take counsel for introducing into her very system a principle of disease and self-destruction.

The only other point to which I shall refer as existing in our church, and as threatening her peace, is nearly the converse of that which was last mentioned, and relates to the licensing of candidates for the ministry. I knew, not long since, a young man, who, after being, for a number of months, on trial for license, before a certain old school Presbytery, rather more than usually respectable for size, talents, learning and piety, was deliberately refused license, on account of alleged immaturity in theological knowledge, and unsoundness in the faith. He immediately applied to another Presbytery, of the new school, more than a hundred miles off, by whom he was promptly licensed, notwithstanding the refusal of the sister judicatory, and with a distinct knowledge of that refusal. Here you will observe, was departure from the doctrine contended for in the other case. *There* it was maintained that a minister licensed and ordained by one Presbytery, and coming to another, with "clean papers," as a minister in good and regular standing, must necessarily be received, *rectus in ecclesia*, upon the principle that the acts of one Presbytery must be respected and sustained by all co-ordinate judicatories. But *here* it was quite as strenuously maintained, that the judgment and act of a sister Presbytery might properly be disregarded. In other words, it seems to be the doctrine of some, at least, of our respected brethren of the New School, that where the act of a sister Presbytery makes *in their favour*, it is to be sustained; but that where it makes *against them*, it is to be set at naught.—It is easy to see that these two doctrines, though diametrically opposite in principle, yet harmonize most perfectly in one respect. So far as they are acted upon, they both alike facilitate the multiplication of candidates of a particular stamp, to an indefinite extent; and would enable, as was before observed, a single Presbytery, if she should be so disposed, to deluge the church with unsound ministers, without her sister Presbyteries being able to interpose any adequate remedy. While the former would feel herself at liberty to act at her pleasure; the latter would be, if I may so express it, bound hand and foot; compelled to receive all who came to them with regular testimonials; and utterly unable to defend either themselves or the rest of the church from the encroachments of error. Is this right? is it not subversive of every sound principle of ecclesiastical government? Is it not adapted to destroy mutual confidence among judicatories, who ought to feel not only that they bear the same name, but that they are in truth, "one body in Christ, and every one members one of another?"

But the question naturally arises, what is the proper remedy in cases such as those of which we have been speaking? Suppose an ordained minister in good standing in his own Presbytery, to be called within the bounds of another, or to wish for any reason, to connect himself with that other. And suppose that, while he presents the most ample testimonials of regular official character from the Presbytery from which he comes, a majority of the members of that which he proposes to join, believe him to be materially unsound in the faith. What is to be done? Has the latter Presbytery no alternative? Must we condider her as *compelled* to receive the candidate for admission without inquiry? If so, then, as before suggested, a single Presbytery might poison, and eventually destroy the whole church. She might soon create a majority of her own way of thinking in every Presbytery within her reach. It cannot be that this is the true theory of Presbyterian church government. By no means. It is evident that the Presbytery to which the candidate applies *may*, if she see her way clear, receive him at once, on the faith of his testimonials, and, as soon as he becomes a member of her body, proceed to arraign and try him, as she may any other of her members, on the charge of heresy. But suppose the Presbytery to which the applicant comes to, foresee, that if she receives him at once to membership, he may, either by artfully tampering with other members, render process very difficult; or, by adding one more vote to a previously large minority, obstruct it altogether; would she be doing justice to the cause of truth to receive him at once, and thus run the risk of strengthening the interests of error within her own bosom, and possibly of giving it a predominant influence? If she distinctly foresaw such a result as likely to ensue, she would be not only justifiable, but bound in duty, to decline admitting such an applicant among the number of her members. However painful such an alternative might be, it would undoubtedly comport with the strictest rules of ecclesiastical order. Every body, ecclesiastical as well as civil, must be considered as having a right to judge of the qualifications of its own members. It ought, indeed, to exercise this right with great wisdom and prudence; and always exercises it on its own responsibility;—but exercise it, it *ought* and *must*, or there is an end of all liberty. This right is inherent in our Presbyteries. When a candidate for admission stands before them, and his testimonials are produced and read, a vote is taken whether to receive him or not. If they have a right in this vote to say *yes*, they, surely, have quite as good a right to say *no*. In other words, the right of voting on the question at all necessarily implies the right of voting either in the affirmative or negative, as they see cause. If they think proper to say *no;*—in other words to reject him, any one of several courses may be taken. The rejected applicant may simply withdraw his application, and take no further step in the business: *or*, the Presbytery which rejected him may represent the case to that from which he came, and by which he was recommended, and may request process to be commenced against him: *or*, the rejected candidate may complain of his non reception to the Synod, and that body may take such order in the case as the rules and edification of the church may appear to require. Two of these courses may appear, at first view, circuitous; but when we consider the value of harmony in an extended community, and the importance, if we would attain it, of adhering to the rules agreed upon by that community; we cannot for a moment doubt, that the most regular course of proceeding, is always the best, and generally the most easy and expeditious.

While on the subject of the respect due from one ecclesiastical judicatory to another; and the necessity of their concurrence in maintaining our ecclesiastical standards, if they would promote either the peace or the purity of the church; there is a matter of so much delicacy that I scarcely know how to speak of it, and at the same time of such vital importance, that I dare not wholly refrain from speaking. I refer to some circumstances which have attended the intercourse between our church and the Congregational churches in *New England*. That intercourse began with the commencement of my ministerial life. I have always been a warm friend to it, and should be grieved at the occurrence of any thing adapted either to interrupt it, or render it less comfortable. If no such intercourse were already constituted, it ought forthwith to be begun. Those who come so near together as the great body of the ministers of *New England* and those of the Presbyterian Church, ought undoubtedly to know and love one another, and to co-operate in the great work of enlightening and converting the world. But while the intercourse in question is delightful to every pious heart, and has been made, I doubt not, mutually useful to the contracting parties, and conducive to the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom; both its comfort and usefulness cannot fail of being painfully interrupted, unless care be taken to guard against some of those sources of misunderstanding, which, however small they may appear in the beginning, will assuredly work wider and deeper mischief as they advance.

The articles of intercourse between the associations of *New England*, and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, are to be considered as a solemn ecclesiastical compact, evidently intended to promote harmony, co-operation and mutual strength. They secure the friendly reception of the ministers and licentiates of each party by the other; and they furnish a virtual, if not a formal pledge, that the peace, purity, and edification of each other, will be respected by both.—Now the spirit of these principles seems to require that each party should abstain from such acts as manifestly militate with the object of the compact; and, of course, that candidates for the ministry which are known to have been rejected by one party, should not be received by the other, and immediately sent back to the party which had rejected them, and there claim reception under the broad shield of this compact. Yet cases of this kind have occurred with a frequency, and painfulness, which cannot fail of being regarded with apprehension by the friends of the Presbyterian Church.

About thirty years ago, a young man presented himself to the Presbytery of *New York*, of which I was then a member, to be taken on trial for license to preach the Gospel. In the preliminary examination as to his experimental acquaintance with religion, he by no means gave satisfaction. The Presbytery, however, determined to pursue his trials a little further, and for the purpose of obtaining more light, gave him several subjects on which to produce written compositions. When these were exhibited, it became so perfectly apparent to the Presbytery that he was destitute of every proper qualification for the sacred office, that they, *unanimously*, resolved to proceed no further in his trials, and advised him to turn his attention to some secular employment. He appeared to acquiesce in their decision; but in a few weeks went to *Massachusetts;* applied to one of the associations in that State; was promptly licensed; and immediately returned to the bosom of the Presbyterian Church; and presented himself as a regular licentiate from *New England*, to the Presbytery in the immediate vicinity of that by which he was rejected. That Presbytery felt itself bound, in courtesy (although the compact between the General Assembly, and the General Association of *Massachusetts*, now existing, had not then been formed,) to receive him as a licentiate in good standing. He was received; was finally with much reluctance ordained; occupied several stations in the church, though none for any length of time; and proved, as long as he lived, a trouble to the judicatories with which he was connected, and a distress to all intelligent and conscientious Christians, for his gross ignorance, and lamentable departure from the correctness of Christian example.

Nor does this case stand alone. Several times, since the date of that to which I have referred, candidates for ordination in our church, who refused to adopt our Confession of Faith, and, of course, were rejected by the respective Presbyteries to which they applied, have gone forthwith to *New England*, and there, with a distinct knowledge of their rejection in the Presbyterian Church, have been immediately ordained, and returned to its bosom, clothed with the ministerial character, and candidates for settlement in Presbyterian churches. Now, though it cannot be said that any formal engagement was violated by these proceedings; although the associations which acted in these cases had a perfect right, on the principles of their government, to decide and act as they did; although I am entirely satisfied that they meant to do nothing unfair or unfriendly; and although it is not known that any extensive mischief in fact resulted from more than one of the cases in question:—yet it is perfectly plain, that if similar proceedings should become frequent, heart-burning and impaired cordiality must be the consequence. Indeed, if such acts were to become very frequent, not to say habitual; if our beloved and respected brethren of the *New England* associations were to allow themselves to license and ordain without reserve, rejected fugitives from our Presbyteries—they might essentially weaken our hands; nay, they might absolutely destroy the discipline of the Presbyterian Church, and render the articles of agreement in question, a curse instead of a blessing.

It ought to be known that this is not a new difficulty. It is not a matter of complaint to which the recent jealousies of conflicting theologians have, for the first time, given rise. More than seventy years ago, the same evil was felt and remonstrated against. The following extract from the proceedings of the Synod of *New York* and *Philadelphia*, then the highest judicatory of our church, at its sessions in 1764, will at once explain and confirm my statement.

"Though the Synod entertains a high regard for the Associated churches of New England; yet we cannot but judge, that students who go to them, or to any other than our own Presbyteries to obtain lincense, in order to return and officiate among us, act very irregularly, and are not to be approved or employed by our Presbyteries; as hereby we are deprived of the right of trying and approving the qualifications of our own candidates.—Yet if any cases shall happen wherein such a conduct may in some circumstances be thought necessary for the greater good of any congregation, it shall be laid before the Presbytery to which the congregation belongs, and be approved of by them."

Here, it will be perceived, the conduct censured was applying to Eastern associations, in the *first instance*, to be licensed, "in order to return and officiate" in the Presbyterian Church. How much louder would have been the complaint against those associations, if they had licensed and ordained candidates which had been *rejected* by our Presbyteries,—knowing them to have been rejected, with the distinct and avowed purpose of preparing them to come back and settle, or at least to preach, in Presbyterian Churches!

It is for the purpose of averting evil, and of guarding against every feeling which may threaten mischief, that I make these remarks. It is because I wish the connexion which exists to be perpetual, and at once, more pleasant and more beneficial on both sides, that I speak thus of the dangers to which it is exposed. If there ever has been an instance in which *we* have failed to pay due respect to the decisions of any of the associations with which we have a conventional intercourse, it is unknown to me; and if such a thing were to occur, I think I should be the first to condemn it, and to make a motion for acknowledging, and repairing our fault.

It was in connexion with uneasiness arising from an event of the kind referred to, that the proposal was made, and carried into effect, several years ago, that the delegates from the several Associations to our General Assembly, and from us to them, should no longer have a *vote* in the decisions of those bodies respectively. The proposal came from *us*, and was prompted by the following considerations.

1. The system of mutual voting by these delegates appeared, on serious consideration, so far as our church was concerned, *unconstitutional*. The form of government under which the General Assembly acts, makes provision for that body maintaining a *correspondence* with sister churches at home and abroad; but not for receiving their members into *authoritative* co-operation with us. It declares very explicity, in what manner the General Assembly shall be constituted by the ministers and ruling Elders from the several Presbyteries; but opens no door for admitting to a complete membership and vote any other description of persons. It was deemed, therefore, that our fathers, in forming this agreement, had gone beyond their constitutional warrant, and that we were, of course, bound to retrace our steps.

2. Some years after our brethren of the *New-England* Associations had established a conventional intercourse with the General Assembly; the Associate Reformed, the Dutch Reformed, and the German Reformed Churches, made overtures for establishing a similar intercourse;—in framing the articles of which, although those bodies are all strictly Presbyterian, yet, such was their adherence to constitutional principles, that the privilege of voting on the part of the delegates reciprocally sent by each party, was expressly precluded. Accordingly, for some years, at the meetings of our General Assembly, the singular spectacle was witnessed of all the delegates from the Congregational churches voting on every question; while those from the Presbyterian churches in correspondence with us were never permitted to vote. This had so strange an appearance, that the friends of impartiality and good neighbourhood thought it of importance that all the delegates from the corresponding churches should be placed on an equal footing. And as our Presbyterian correspondents would not consent either to *give* or *take* the voting power, it was deemed most judicious to abolish it in regard to all.

3. In 1821, when our form of government was revised, it was judged best to take away even *from our own corresponding members*, the right of voting. As the constitution of the Church had stood before, when a member of one of our Presbyteries happened to be present at the session of another Presbytery, he was, commonly, of course, invited to sit as a corresponding member; and when he did so, was allowed not only to speak, but also to vote, as if he had been a stated and plenary member of the Presbytery in which he held this temporary seat. On the revision of our Form of Government, in the year just mentioned, it was judged best, for weighty reasons, to declare, that such corresponding members should, thereafter, be allowed to sit and deliberate, but *not to vote*. In these circumstances it was surely not equal to continue to the delegates of corresponding sister churches, a privilege which we had deliberately thought proper to withdraw from the corresponding members of our own denomination.

4. Finally, the General Assembly was deliberately brought to the conclusion that the voting system of the delegates from the Congregational Churches ought to be abolished, because this power, as enjoyed in *their* bodies and *ours* was by no means of equal potency. On the one hand, it is well known that our General Assembly is a judicial body; that its decisions are *authoritative*, and bind the churches which are represented by its members, On the other hand, it is equally well known, that the General Association of the Congregational Churches have no judicial authority; that they are only *advisory* bodies; and, of course, that a vote given in them binds no one, not even those, strictly speaking, who concur in it. Here, then, is an immense difference in the potency of votes. In our General Assembly, if there should happen to be nearly a tie, a single delegate or two from an association, if they enjoyed the privilege of voting, might absolutely turn the scale, and give law to the Church on a most important point; or might be instrumental in deciding an interesting case of discipline in a manner contrary to the wishes of a real majority of the Church. While in the Association, supposing one of our delegates to enjoy the privilege of voting, the utmost that his vote *could* avail, would be to carry a question in favour of giving *advice*. It could, in no case whatever, carry with it an authoritative power. To many warm friends of the intercourse system, this difference appeared too serious to be disregarded. The truth is, that on more than one occasion, while the system of delegate voting continued, the General Assembly has been so nearly divided, that, if the votes from the Association did not decide the vote of the Assembly, they came very near it, and might have done so in reality. Can it surprise any one that such a fact should be regarded with some apprehension? It must be acknowledged, indeed that our *New England* brethren have never discovered the least disposition to take the advantage of such a power on any occasion; but we might easily conceive of a state of things in which the enjoyment of it would be by no means unattended with hazard.

My reasons for mentioning this subject, in the present connection are chiefly two.

1. Because I am sensible that painful feelings have been excited in the minds of some by the abolition of the system of delegate voting. These feelings, I am confident, could never have been indulged, if the whole subject, in all its bearings, had been well understood.

2. Because I am more and more convinced that if the intercourse in question is to be maintained

with comfort, and to edification, it will be of great importence that the rules and feelings of each party be, in all cases in which it is practicable, affectionately respected. Those families which the providence of God has placed in the immediate vicinity of each other, and whose circumstances give rise to much intercourse, must habitually consult the feelings and interests of one another, if they desire to dwell together in peace. Long, very long may the correspondence between our *New England* brethren and ourselves continue! And, henceforth, may there be no other strife between us than who shall love one another, and our common Master with the most fervent affection, and who shall do most for the conversion of the world to the knowledge and likeness of that Master!

And, by the way, while speaking of our *New England* brethren, it gives me unfeigned pleasure to *know*, that a large portion of the most enlightened, venerable and pious of the clergy in that part of the United States, lament and deprecate, as much as any individual in our church can do, the disposition which has been manifested by some to propagate the *Pelagianizing* sentiments alluded to in a former letter. It will, indeed, be deeply to be deplored, if, while these excellent men are frowning upon this pestiferous system, within their own bosom, and regarding its patrons as dangerous corruptors of truth; it should find countenance in any of the judicatories of the Presbyterian Church! Nothing more, I am persuaded, is necessary, under God, to save us from this calamity than a fraternal understanding and co operation among that large majority of the "new-school" ranks in our body, who are known to reprobate the philosophical deceits in question. If *they* will faithfully unite in setting their faces against these erroneous opinions, and withholding their licensing and ordaining suffrages from all who avoid them, they may become happily instrumental in harmonizing the Church, as well as promoting its purity. It is in *their* power, humanly speaking, to do more for the peace and edification of our beloved department of Zion than in that of any other equal number of individuals in our communion. If, however, these respected brethren of the "new-school," who are the real friends of substantial orthodoxy, should indulge their party feelings to the uttermost, and feel more desirous to oppose and thwart those whom they call the "ultra orthodox," than to resist the encroachments of heresy, and the acts and inroads of real disorders; the prospect is indeed gloomy; the issue must be disastrous!

And now, my Christian brethren, in regard to adherence to the doctrinal standards of our Church, on which I have so long detained you, I have done. I have spoken my mind with the freedom of one who is conscious of an honest desire for peace, but who prefers *truth* even to *peace*. I have not intentionally magnified a single evil, or inconsiderately sounded a single note of alarm. If I have in the least degree overstated facts, no one will more cordially rejoice than myself to find the overstatement proved. And now, at the close I ask—WHAT WILL YOU DO? The question is not, whether, in opposing erroneous opinions, you will patronize a system of "ultra" rigour, of inquisitorial strictness. This I have never approved, and have no wish to see applied. But the question is, whether, you will honestly and with good faith maintain the system of doctrine which every minister and elder of the Presbyterian Church has solemnly engaged to sustain? Again I ask—WHAT WILL YOU DO? Will you keep up the "land marks" which your fathers with so much labour, and with so many prayers and tears erected, and bequeathed to you; or will you abandon them? Will you adhere, as faithful witnesses, to that testimony in favour of truth, which, in the old world and in the new, God has so signally blessed to the glory of his Church; or will you suffer it to be trampled under your feet? Will you call a convention of the whole church, and attempt to *alter* your Confession of Faith, and to make its articles either so unmeaning, or so general, that persons of every grade of opinion, short of Unitarianism, may honestly subscribe it? An alternation has been publicly proposed, and is, perhaps, wished for by some. Make the attempt; and, instead of really mending this venerable and precious monument of oxthodoxy, you will have it a disfigured and mutilated carcase, less satisfactory *to any party* than it is at the present moment. Or, while it stands in your book, as an evidence of what the Presbyterian Church once was, and still ought to be—will you suffer one article of it after another to be *nullified*, in fact, by reckless subscription, until its whole dignity and authority shall perish together? In other words, will you suffer men of coarse and ductile consciences, with the philosophy and the language of Pelagianism on their lips, to be guilty of the solemn, dishonest mockery of subscribing your Calvinistic creed, and entering your judicatories? If this be admitted, you will soon fill our beloved church (with anguish of spirit I write it) not merely with the elements of fearful repulsion and explosion; but what is unspeakably more to be dreaded,—with the seeds of spiritual desolation and death, with which the ears of every Christian who hears shall tingle! Or finally, will you faithfully maintain that creed in its true spirit and meaning, and let those who cannot honestly subscribe it, seek a connexion with some other portion of the great Christian family? These questions must soon be decided. The crisis is approaching. God grant that you may decide them in such a manner as most effectually to promote his glory, and the purity and edification of our beloved Zion!

SAMUEL MILLER.

Princeton, February, 1833.

From the Connecticut Observer.

Early Admissions to the Church.

It is common, in some places—not however in this region—to receive to baptism and to the fellowship of the church, supposed converts almost as soon as the hope of reconciliation to God through our Lord Jesus Christ, is awaked in their souls. The subject, then, whether converts, real or supposed, shall be admitted to the church as soon as an opportunity presents after they express faith in Christ, deserves serious consideration. Hitherto, in most parts of New-England there has been great caution used in the reception of members to the privileges of the church. This caution has not been, thus far, diminished by the multiplied and sudden conversions that have occurred during revivals. Indeed, we believe it will be found to be the fact, that since the revivals which commenced about the close of the last century, there has been an increase of caution. There has been greater strictness in the examination of candidates, both in regard to the doctrines which they believe, and to the exercises of their minds. There has been more anxiety that the church should be purer as well as larger—and to this circumstance we attribute it, that while there has been a succession of powerful revivals, they have maintained their character, and been regarded as more and more desirable. Had all who have indulged the hope of having passed from death unto life, in New-England, the last thirty years, and who appeared well to human view for one or two weeks, been admitted to the church in that period, it is our deep conviction that revivals would ere this have sunk into so great discredit that no sober, no rational man, would desire their continuance. We do not believe our churches could have borne the shock thirty years. They would have come down to the level of the world, and been the laughing-stock of men. We ask our readers to run over, in their own minds, the hopes quenched in darkness, in a few days after they were lighted up, that have fallen under their own observation.—Had the persons that indulged these hopes all been admitted to the church, what a scene would have followed! Either this mass of ice would have benumbed the energies of the churches, or they would have been continually agitated and harassed by the exercise of discipline. And if ever so faithful in discipline, they would, for a long time, have had to bear the reproach of the ungodliness of these deceived members.

And what is proposed to be gained by these hasty admissions? What will the churches gain? A temporary increase of numbers. But if they are strict in discipline, this swelling list must soon be reduced.—And what will individuals gain? If they are genuine converts they will hold out through a trial of some few weeks. If they cannot bear this test, better to have it known before they become a part of the church. Converts need not be neglected, and the fires in their bosoms be left to expire, even if they are not admitted to the church on the day they hope they begin a new life. The short season which follows conversion and precedes admission to the church, is a most profitable period in the christian life. In the character of catechumens the converts receive instructions adapted to their wants, and are as carefully guarded from the enemy as if enclosed within the folds of the church.

By a short delay, then, the converts receive no harm, and the church is guarded against unconverted members. Why not, then, delay admission for a brief period? We know the answer to this question—though we have not room, this week, to dwell at length on it. The answer, in short, is that admission was immediate in the days of the Apostles, and that it is the convert's duty immediately to obey the command, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' as really as to obey immediately the command to repent and believe, or any other command in the Bible. The argument from the practice of the Apostles was answered, and we think satisfactorily, in a quotation we made some time since from the Christian Spectator. The argument that because we ought immediately to repent, we are therefore bound at once to unite with the church, seems to us not conclusive. Repentance is an act which we can perform without any reference to our fellow men. Not so admission to the church. There is another party concerned—the previous members. If it is the duty of the supposed convert, without any delay for the sake of testing the soundness of his hope by the fruits of the life, to unite with the church, it is not the duty of the church to receive him, without evidence of piety. '*Keep thyself pure*,' is an important command to the church—and the mere profession of the supposed convert that he believes on the Lord Jesus Christ, does not, in our estimation, require that he should be admitted, without the fruits of holiness in the life, and a sound doctrinal faith, to the privileges of the church. When we discuss the subject, then, of *early admissions*, we have to look not only to the duty of the convert, but to the duty and purity and safety of the church. When we urge *repentance*, we have reference only to the duty of the person whom we address. The two cases, therefore, are not analgous and the illustration fails. For even if we could show that it is as much the duty of the convert to unite immediately, with the church, as it was to repent immediately, the other part of the subject would yet remain open for discussion—whether it is the duty of the church, without any other evidence of piety than the supposed convert's own word, to receive him.

Some, perhaps, may claim that it is the immediate duty of every one as soon as he thinks himself a convert, to unite with the church, and, therefore, that it must be the duty of the church to receive him. But this would destroy all the discretionary power of the church in the admission of members. It would take away from the church the right of examining the candidate. It would throw down every defence against pollution, which now guards the church. It would open the door of the church to every one, whatever his feelings, or his doctrines, or his moral character might be, who should assert his belief that he is a convert. None, we presume, would be ready to practice what would lead to such consequences.

The church, we take it for granted, has a right to require *satisfactory evidence of piety*, of any one who claims admission to its privileges. Nay, more, it is an absolute duty for the church, previous to his admission, to be in possession of such evidence—either by examination before the church, or before a committee appointed for that purpose. Now what is satisfactory evidence of piety? Is the mere hope of the convert, in the midst of circumstances peculiarly fitted to bias his judgment, and without time to test the sincerity of that hope, satisfactory evidence of piety?—Others, once as confident of their conversion as the candidate is, have been deceived—and they have too been undeceived in the course of a very few days. We do not believe there has been a revival, of any considerable extent, in New England, the present century, in which some, who hoped they were born again, have not in a short time, given ample evidence that they had thought more highly of themselves than they ought to think. It was so a hundred years since. President Edwards, who was supposed, in his day, to be a friend of revivals, and to know something respecting them, says, 'It appears plainly to have been in the visible church of God, in times of great revivals of religion, from time to time, as it is with the fruit trees in the spring; there are a multitude of blossoms, all of which appear fair and beautiful, and there is a promising appearance of young fruits; *but many of them are of but short continuance, they soon fall off, and never come to maturity.*' Is, then, the mere expression of hope, or the exultation of joy, satisfactory evidence of a change of heart—of evangelical piety? If not, the church, doing its duty, will demand more. Tell us not that this satisfied the Apostles—and ought to satisfy men now. It does not satisfy—it will not satisfy—it cannot satisfy in ordinary cases, those whose eyes have been open to facts. The evidence derived from the mere indulgence of a hope of conversion is greater, it is true, in some cases than in others. When men of well-balanced minds, and cool judgment, thoroughly acquainted with the truths of the Gospel, and in circumstances which make it a severe trial to express a personal interest in religious things, hope that they have passed from death unto life, the evidence is far more satisfactory than it is in some cases which we might mention. But even in their case it is better to test the hope.—And what if the Apostles, in the circumstances at that time, did rest satisfied with the bare profession of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, on the part of the convert—does it prove that they would do it in the circumstances of the present period, and in this country? To express hope in Christ during the progress of a revival, is, in most parts of our land, and in most instances, far, very far from a sacrifice of personal feelings, or a hazarding of personal interests, or an exposure to personal sufferings.—If men had the cross or the stake in view, as the probable price of expressing a hope in Christ—if the reception of the Gospel now, as in primitive times, 'set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother in-law,' then, indeed, this hope would, in its very buddings, show some indications of the existence of christian principle. But what satisfying evidence can it afford the church now, when it requires no sacrifice, incurs no danger, induces no obloquy,—and especially when it is, in fact, seen in a multitude of cases, to be consistent with a deceived heart, and with quick-coming apostacy?

Roman Catholic Controversy.

From the Presbyterian.

CONTROVERSY. No. VI.

RULES.

The undersigned, agreeing to have an amicable discussion of the great points of religious controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics, do hereby bind themselves to the observance of the following rules.

1. The parties shall write and publish, alternately, in the weekly religious papers called the Presbyterian, and a Roman Catholic paper, to be furnished by the first of January, it being understood that the communications shall be published after the following plan:—One party opening the first week, the other party replying the next week, and every piece to be republished in the immediately succeeding number of the Roman Catholic paper. The communications not to exceed four columns of the Presbyterian, nor to continue beyond six months, without consent of parties.

2. The parties agree that there is an infallible Rule of Faith established by Christ, to guide us in matters of religion, for the purpose of determining disputes in the Church of Christ.

3. They moreover agree that after giving their views of the Rule of Faith, they shall proceed to discuss the question, "Is the Protestant religion, the religion of Christ?"

4. The parties agree respectfully, to adhere strictly to the subject of discussion, for the time being, and to admit no second question until the first shall have been exhausted. Each party shall be the judge when he is done with a subject, and shall be at liberty to occupy his time with a second topic, when he is done with the first, leaving to the other party the liberty of continuing to review the abandoned topic as long as he shall choose; subject, however, to be answered, if he introduce new matter.

5. Mr. Hughes to open the discussion, and Mr. Breckinridge to follow, according to the dictates of his own judgement.

JOHN BRECKINRIDGE,
JOHN HUGHES.

Philadelphia, December 14th, 1832.

RULE OF FAITH.

New York, 5th March, 1833.

To the Rev. John Hughes,

Rev. Sir,—You rise from your prostration with the air of victory. It is however, I think, a little abatement to your chivalry, that you should still *cry out* against my arguments, and yet meet them, in chief part, with reiterated complaints of my departure from "the Rules," and clamorous demands to keep to the question. When you proposed to undertake a discussion with me, I requested a reply to my first printed letter. You declined. I proposed a public, oral discussion. You declined. After much negotiation, the present channel was agreed on. The rules were, very much, of your own defining; you insisted that we should first discuss the rule of faith, and *you* must begin. I proposed that after examining the rule of faith, we should take this for the point of debate, "Is the religion of *Roman Catholics* the religion of Christ!" "You still declined, and we must change it to this, "Is the religion of *Protestants* the religion of Christ!" And now, after all these concessions, you claim to *interpret* these rules, and even to *determine how I* shall conduct my argument; and while the nerves of your cause are cracking under the pressure of truth, gravely charge me with violating rules and passing by the question! I am weary of this unmanly strife of words, and "vain jangling" about modes and forms. Once for all, therefore, let me settle this matter. If the reader will refer to "the rules," at the head of this letter, he will perceive that the 3d assigns the "*rule of faith*" as the first subject of discussion, and with the following amplitude, "*after giving their views of the rule of faith*," &c. Does not this bring up the whole subject of the rule of faith? The 4th rule requires us, "*to adhere strictly to the subject of discussion for the time being—and to admit no second question*," &c &c. Now I ask, have I not discussed, throughout, one and the same question, viz. the rule of faith!—Both in my first and second letters, (Nos. 2 and 4,) I replied to all your objections. But I did not stop there. I went on to expose your rule. By a great number of yet unanswered arguments, I proved its utter fallibility. I have shown, by the confession of your own writers, that you are compelled to use *private interpretation*, by fallible men, in order to find out from the Bible your church and your rule: I have exposed your judge of controversies, as one whom you could not agree on among yourselves, and who could not possibly be a judge, from the nature of the case: I have shown that your church has varied in doctrine from age to age, and therefore has not an infallible judge in her, as she pretends to have: I have shown that the direct tendency of your system was to corrupt the morals of the people and the worship of God, and therefore your rule was entirely fallible, and even greatly evil: I have shown that your rule usurps the prerogative of God, and that it violates the testimony of the senses: that it was not only fallible, but entirely uncertain: that it requires ignorance and implicit faith as its foundation in the minds of men: that it is incompatible, not only with personal, but with civil liberty: that under the guidance of your rule, the Bible has been shut against mankind: that the commandments have been mutilated, additions made to the word of God, and that new articles, and new sacraments have been added, under the authority of your rule: that even "the Fathers," the professed fountain of evidence in your behalf, have been purged of matter which went against you: and that by the authority of the Pope, writers in your communion of a later day, have been abridged, enlarged, or changed, to fit them to be witnesses to the Roman Catholic Rule. These things have been clearly shown, as may be seen by a reference to the letters themselves. I ask do they not bear directly on the question!' Your chief reply to them as yet, is that they violate the rules! When you attempt a rejoinder, the public will judge both of their fitness and their force.

Before I enter on the examination of your reasoning, it is proper here to meet and repel a paragraph near the close of your letter, viz. "But a more painful task is imposed on me, in reference to two or three assertion of yours, in which there is an entire departure from the truth of history and of facts. You assert that opinions pass into articles of faith or doctrine in the Catholic Church, and for this you quote the authority of Bellarmine; but I defy you to quote ten lines *before* and ten lines *after*, the words 'fere de fide,' without convicting yourself of what is not becoming 'a minister of the Gospel.'" Now I had said in my letter, "your church has added to the word of God new articles of faith, and even new sacraments to the institutions of Jesus Christ." I appealed for proof to various writers, and to the Bull of Pope Pius IV. You say nothing of these proofs. I then added, "*Bellarmine we suppose means this* when he says of one article, 'fere de fide,' almost a matter of faith." Now if, instead of "slurring the notes," you had quoted from Bellarmine ten lines "before and ten lines after" the offensive passage, it would have come with a better grace than a Parthian arrow shot while in flight. But you proceed to remark, "In the same manner you say that Leo X. condemned Luther for saying: *It is not in the power of the church or the Pope to constitute new articles of faith.—This is untrue.* Being a mere historical *fact*, if it is not untrue, you can easily prove the contrary." This is strong language! Yet you put the subject to a fair issue; let us try it—it is done in few words. The bull of Leo X. dated June 15, 1520, levelled at Luther by name, contains forty one pretended heresies, which are extracted from his writings and solemnly condemned—his books are doomed to the flames—and he allowed sixty days to recant, or meet the thunders of the Vatican. The 27th article, for which Luther is anathematized for holding, is as follows: "Certum est in manu Ecclesiæ aut Papæ *prorsus non esse statuere articulos fidei*." Which is, word for word, what I said before, viz. "*It is certain it is not in the power of the Pope or church, to ordain, or decree articles of faith.*" He denounces this and the other forty articles as "pestiferous," "scandalous," "seductive errors."—And yet you assert that "*it is untrue!*" My proof then, is fully fortified. I would willingly explain your mistake by referring it to ignorance—and your being startled at the statement shows the monstrous nature of the doctrine. But how shall I account for your *indecorum;* especially after convicting you of such an error!

I must however go into the defence of yet another "assertion," as you style it. "Another assertion which is *not true* is that as to the Pope's supremacy—there are no less than three systems in our (the Roman Catholic) church." I gave you proof of this when it was stated; but I will subjoin more. The council of Basle, A. D. 1439 (see Caranza's summa conciliorum, 33d, sessions, page 645) decreed as follows: *That according to the Council of Constance, it is a true article of the Catholic faith, that a Council is above a Pope, and that whoever pertinaciously rejects this truth, is to be condemned as a heretic.*" Here, besides its own testimony, that of the Council of Constance is likewise conveyed. *This is one system.* It gives to the Pope a rank not only unequal in *degree*, but dissimilar in *kind* from the *second* system, which is called *Italian*, from its being the prevailing one at Rome, as the former is called *Gallican*, from its prevalence in France. The Italian school or second system hold to the Pope's *unlimited sovereignty* over the church; and make him officially infallible and virtually *the church*. The Council of Florence, 5th Lateran and Trent make the Pope superior to general Councils. This you will hardly deny—if so, I have proof at hand. Johannes Devotus (Vol. 1. Book 1. Tit. 3 sec. 1) on the supremacy of the Pope has this caption: "The power of the Pope is episcopal, metropolitan, patriarchal and temporal. His decisions *from the chair* are infallible." The *third system deifies the Pope*. According to Gregory II, "the whole Western nations reckoned Peter a terrestrial God." (Labb, 8. 666.) We are told that Marcellus, in the Lateran Council, called Julius, "a God on earth," and without rebuke from the Council. Bellarmine on authority of Councils, Book 2, c. 17—says: "all the names which are given in the Scriptures to Christ, even these same names are given to the Pope—whence it appears that he is superior to the church." In Gratian's Decretals, 1. p. Dis. 96, Pope Nicholas to Michael; 7th chap. the Pope says, *He is a God, and therefore men cannot judge him.* I might multiply these proofs at pleasure. Here then are the *said three systems* distinctly made out. How you can then so positively say it "*is not true*," our fellow citizens must judge.

We are now come to quite an era in this discussion, viz: *the first defence of your rule of faith!* Though it be in the 6th letter of the controversy, and its appearance now is only a peep at us from behind the clouds, yet we welcome its approach. Our rule of faith, you say, is laid down in the Apostles' Creed. "*I believe in the Holy Catholic Church.* This rule, you perceive, does not exclude, but comprises the belief of the Holy Scriptures." It may be said to be in substance *this, the Holy Catholic Church is the living infallible interpreter of Scripture.* Now it will be borne in mind that before any church can *interpret*, she must know what is to be *interpreted*. What do you mean then by "*the Holy Scriptures!*" The council of Trent has settled this question for you, infallibly, (as you say,) "ALL THE BOOKS CONTAINED IN THE OLD VULGATE LATIN EDITION ARE SACRED AND CANONICAL." (Decree of the Coun. Trent 4 sess.) Then besides our Bible the Roman Catholic Scriptures include a number of books viz. 1 and 2 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and 1 and 2 Maccabees. These make a *large volume* of themselves. The Jews, our Lord Jesus, the Apostles and early Fathers, unite to *exclude* these from the canon. You ought then to have *proved* them canonical, or dropped them from the scriptures, as a preliminary step. The former you do not attempt; the latter were *heresy* in you.—When you say then that the Holy Scriptures are comprised in your rule, you deceive the reader, —since by "Holy Scriptures" he means one thing and you quite another thing.—Again, in defining your rule, you omit two other very material features which are strongly brought to view by the Council of Trent, (4 Sess.) 1. They say divine truth is contained both in the written books and "IN UNWRITTEN TRADITION." 2. Every Roman Catholic of every grade, binds himself solemnly as follows, "*I will never take or interpret them, (the second Scriptures) otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.*" (See Creed of Pope Pius IV.) Now it is apparent from these facts, that what you call divine truth is quite another thing from the Bible; and it is equally clear that your church is restricted by her own decrees, to *interpret* this compound of Bible, Apocryphal unwritten tradition, according to the unanimous consent of "the fathers." At this point, we see then either that "the fathers" were infallible and also unanimous in their interpretations of Scripture, or else your church receives her creed from fallible men, and can have no uniformity in her doctrines. But "the fathers" you will own, were *fallible;* and that they were far from *unanimous*, I will presently unite with your Bellarmine and others, to prove. Let me hear you say, that the Roman Catholic rule, though withheld by you, is spread at large upon the records of your church, and from it I draw these definitions. If I err in them, the task of confutation is easy.

Having laid down your rule of faith, you proceed to prove that it was established by Christ, by an appeal to the Apostolical commission given Matt. xxviii. 17—20. The reader will please refer to it. Allow me here to put by the side of this, those passages which, added to it, make out the commission in full. "And these signs shall follow them that believe; in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues." "They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. Mark xvi. 17, 18. "And ye are witnesses of these things."—And behold I send the promise of my father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." Luke xxiv. 48, 49. "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth."—Acts i. 8.

Now we freely grant that the above passages confer a commission on the Apostles; and that they were divinely endowed, for the discharge of the great work which was given them to do. But on these texts you found the following reasoning; "*In the commission referred to above, all nations and all days even to the end of the world are included. Therefore the fulfilment of the Saviour's injunction, required that the Apostles should have successors in the ministry of teaching.*" "*Then it is not by exercising an unfounded prerogative, but in simple obedience to the injunction of Jesus Christ, that Catholics hearken to the voice of the church and the teaching of its pastors.*" The sum of it is this: the Apostles had certain divine endowments for their work; Christ intended the Apostles to have successors to the end of time; therefore their successors must have the same endowments. Now what was it that constituted an Apostle! (1.) No man could be an Apostle who had not been "an *eye witness*" to Christ's person, and works. (see Luke 1. 2. and 2 Peter i. 16.) Paul says, I Corinthians ix. 1. "*Am I not an Apostle! Have I not seen the Lord.*" (See Acts i. 21—22 and x. 41.) (2) An Apostle *must receive his mission directly from Christ*, not by any human ordination. For this reason, Christ appeared to Paul visibly on his way to Damascus, and called him to the work of an Apostle; and this, is what Paul means when he says, "*Last of all he (Christ) was seen of me, as of one born out of due time.*" 1 Cor. xv. 8. (3.) Every Apostle had *miraculous* and *extraordinary endowments:* such as inspiration, making him *infallible;* the gift of tongues; power to work miracles, (Mark xvi. 17—18.) and to impart that power to others. (2 Cor. xii 12.) The apostles were told, (Acts i. 8.) to wait at Jerusalem for these supernatural gifts; and on the day of Pentecost they were accordingly furnished from on high, by the miraculous and extraordinary effusions of the Holy Ghost. By these endowments, they were enabled to speak at once many languages! to write inspired books; to cast out devils, raise the dead, &c. (4.) Every Apostle, as the name (*one sent*) signifies and as the terms of the commission plainly show; was to go all abroad, with plenary authority; not to be stationary; or make his permanent seat any where, exclusively. Now it is obvious that the Apostles had no successors in these respects. It was impossible *after* the generation, in which Christ lived, has passed away, that the Apostles could have *such successors;* for it was necessary to their office and work *to have seen the Lord*. But this the second generation could not have done. It is plain also that such a succession was never designed by our Lord, or attempted by the Christians of the next age. It is true JUDAS had a successor; but it was before the Apostles were fully endued by the Spirit and sent forth. And if *any* were to have successors, why not *all*, as well as *one?* Why not James at Jerusalem, John at Ephesus, and Paul at Antioch, as well as Peter at Rome! Why *Rome* more than eleven other cities! Will not all the texts you have quoted, apply as well to James at Jerusalem as to Peter at Rome! Had he not the promise of the same *Holy Spirit* to guide him as Peter! Is not John called "a pillar" (Gal. ii. 9.) as well as Peter! Why do you single out *infallibility* for your succession, and leave out all *other* qualifications: It is curious to remark how you omit even a *reference* to Mark xvi. 17—18, where the gift of miracles is so inseparably united to the office of an Apostle. You must admit, then, that there *are some respects in which the* Apostles had no successors. But if *some things* are wanting, your argument is vain. If *some things* are wanting, may not one of them be infallibility! And if *all the other* super-human endowments ceased, why should infallibility continue! The conclusion is irresistible, that the Apostles had no successors, endued with extraordinary powers of any kind; and therefore the Roman Catholic rule of faith was not established by Christ.

But yet we hold to a commission still standing and binding, which reaches to the close of time: we believe in a visible catholic (not Roman) church, to which appertain the ministry, the oracles, and ordinances of God; which is to continue to the end of the world—to which the Holy Spirit is promised as an abiding gift; against which the gates of hell shall not prevail; and which is at last to fill the world. Of this church, Jesus Christ is the only head; and the Holy Spirit speaking in the Bible, the only infallible rule of faith.

You next introduce some of "the Fathers" to prove that the texts quoted by you were understood in their days, as you interpret them. I would here say that "*The Fathers*" have a hard lot in your church. You treat them as some do their "*children*," or as the Hindoos do their idol-gods; they *humour* them when they serve their purpose; and *whip* them when they do not. I have already shown the corrections to which they have sometimes been subjected, to square them to the uses of the church. Now let me bring some proofs directly to our purpose. Chrysostom, (who lived A. D. 398.) says, "*the church is known (tantummodo.) only by the Scriptures.*" (Homil. 49 in Matt.) Bellarmine however says of this passage, "*It is probable the author was a Catholic, but it seems to be none of Chrysostom's.*"—(De Scriptis Ecc's. A. D. 398.) Augustine, who lived A. D. 395, says, "Thou art Peter, and upon the rock, which thou hast confessed, upon *this rock*, which thou hast known, saying, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God, will I build my church; I will build thee upon me, not me upon thee." (De verb. Domin. Serm. 13.) Yet Stapleton says of it, "it was a human error caused by the diversity of the Greek and Latin tongue which either he was ignorant of, or marked not." (Princip. doct. lib. 6. c. 3.) But I will pass to examine an authority quoted by yourself, from Tertullian in his book of Prescriptions, &c. &c. From the manner in which you extract it, the author is made to testify, that Rome is the great centre and head, where the "SUCCESSION" from the Apostles has its seat; and where the "Happy Church," reigns in undisturbed supremacy. Your quotation runs thus: "If you live near Italy, you see before your eyes the Roman church. Happy church! to which the Apostles left the inheritance of doctrines with their blood! where Peter was crucified like his master, where Paul was beheaded like the Baptist."—But let us see his entire, ungarbled statement: "Survey the apostolical churches, in which the very chairs of the Apostles still preside over their stations, in which their own letters are recited, uttering the voice and representing the presence of each of them. Is Achai nearest to thee! Thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast the Phillipians and the Thessalonians. If thou canst go to Asia, thou hast Ephesus; but if thou art near Italy, thou hast Rome, whence to us also authority is near at hand." (Prescriptions against Heretics.) And now, how very different is the passage and the meaning! How directly against Peter's supremacy and the exclusive claims of Rome! How extraordinary the liberty which you take with the author and with historical evidence! It was thus a man once proved from the 14th Psalm that there is no God—"The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God," is the entire verse. But dropping the first part of the sentence, it runs thus, "There is no God."

You ask in the second place, "Is the rule infallible!" and infer that it is, since it is established by Christ. I grant you that a rule established by Christ, *is infallible*. But as I have proved that Christ did not establish your rule, your conclusion falls to the ground. But let us proceed. It is not self-evident that your church is infallible, or your rule the true one. By what process then do you apply these texts to the *proof* of your rule! The process, I answer, of *private interpretation*. Then I would ask, is your interpretation fallible or infallible! If fallible, where is the right or safety of your interpretation, especially when the point in question is no less than that on which all others depend, viz. *where shall we go for an infallible rule!* This is the more surprising, as you charge upon the use of private judgment all the evils of heresy and schism, which have in every age rent the church of Christ—perverted the word of God—and ruined the souls of men. Do your refer me to your infallible Church! But we are inquiring after the *proof* of her infallibility. Then does she refer me to Scripture passages for *proof?* But how can I be certain that her interpretation is correct! Her infallibility does not *assure* me, for she has not yet *proved* her infallibility; and if she can prove her infallibility in *this way*, then private judgment is sufficient to settled the undoubted meaning of a great body of scripture-passages, and terminate the *grand controversy*, on which all others depend. And what then becomes of the church of Rome's complaint of the great obscurity of Scripture, which is affirmed to render her aid so indispensable! And what must we think of her outcries against the supposed arrogance of pretending to the exercise of free inquiry, and of judging of the Scriptures for ourselves, when, without such an exercise and such a power of judging, it is found impossible to obtain the least *proof* or presumption of her pretended infallibility? *Some parts* of Scripture then, the church of Rome herself must allow, are capable

of being understood without her aid. Those declarations on which she rests her claim to implicit submission and obedience, she *must* allow to be sufficiently plain and intelligible to bind the conscience of every member of her communion, who is prepared to give a reason for his being a Catholic: and as an entire agreement with the dogmas of the church is all the faith which she requires, in order to the salvation of her members, *she* must acknowledge, as well as ourselves, that the Scripture contains a rule of faith sufficient for the purpose of salvation. The only difference is, that in our opinion, the scriptures clearly unfold a system of saving truth; while in that of the (Roman) Catholics *they are obscure in every point, except the few passages which direct us to the church*, (the only authentic and immediate source of saving knowledge.) "Her treatment of Scripture, almost reminds us of the fabulous history of Jupiter, who ascended to supreme power by the mutilation and banishment of his father."—Robert Hall.

We see then that your rule utterly fails as to the *proof of itself*. *In the next place it wholly fails in its application.* For either the Pope is infallible; or the council; or both united; or the universal church. It seems not to be agreed among yourselves where infallibility is lodged, and therefore even at the threshold a great difficulty arises. If the universal church be the seat, this is plainly useless, for you can never come at its decisions. If the Pope be so, the world must go to Rome; or die in darkness. If a Pope, and a general Council united make the infallible judge, (which is not self-evident, and must therefore be proved.) then as Roman Catholics commonly believe, you have the absurdity, that *two fallibles make an infallible*. Two negatives may make an affirmative in Grammar; but it will not do so in religion—for if you add *fallible to fallible* forever, the *sum* is fallible still. But if the infallible judge, (which is your rule of faith,) be found in the Pope and Council united, still it is out of the reach of the people. Such a council has not been held for two hundred and seventy years! But to answer any end, it ought to hold a constant session.—And not only so, but it ought to be omnipresent—for otherwise the millions of the people, which you speak of, in "France, Scotland, Germany, Greece, Spain, Egypt, Palestine, China, Italy, Ireland Peru, Canada, our own Republic, and in every Island, and on every Continent, and in every country under heaven"—cannot consult this *oracle*. *All these* millions are concerned to know its declarations; yet cannot; and ruin ensues. For there are only two possible ways to reach the mass of men, viz., either by *living teachers*, or by the *decrees of councils*. But both these methods are *liable to error;* you are therefore without a rule. No teacher is infallible, as you allow; the decrees of the councils which few possess and fewer read, are at least as obscure as the Bible. The private interpretation of the Bible you call "*the grand heresy of the Reformation;*" surely *then the private interpretation of decrees*, is not *less* an evil! *It appears then, that your boasted infallible rule is utterly inapplicable;* and while you decry the Bible, in the hands of the people, as the rule of faith, you have no *substitute;* and your cause in ruined.

I remark next, *that your reasoning as to an infallible rule of faith, if well founded, leads us to reject every system that does not make all men perfect.* For you agree that Christ has established an infallible rule to "*guide us in matters of religion*," as well as "*settle disputes*" in his church. You argue that a rule which does not "settle disputes" *as to doctrine*, is fallible, and therefore not Christ's rule. Now by parity of reasoning, a rule that does not regulate *practice* so as to make an *end of sin*, and make *men perfect here*, must be a fallible rule. For faith is in order to holiness—and the rule of faith looks finally "*to the purifying of our souls even as Christ is pure.*" But your rule, I need hardly say, "*makes none of the comers thereunto perfect.*" On the contrary, one of your own distinguished advocates said, that the generality of your writers on morals, seemed "*to have it as their great business, to teach how near a man might lawfully come, and yet not sin.*" (Sir Thomas More.) Surely then if you are consistent, you should reject your rule. I do not see how you can retain it, and yet argue against the Bible as a rule of faith, because it fails to make those infallible who adopt it as such.

You take peculiar pleasure in associating the Protestant name and cause with infidelity and extreme heresies. The names of "Volney and Priestly," of "Universalists," "Unitarians," &c. &c. seem to fluctuate through your fancy in close alliance with liberty of thought, with the use of the Bible, and the freedom of the press. Now it is very certain that the Bible never made a *Roman Catholic;* and the fear expressed by one of the defenders of your faith in former days, that its *free perusal made Protestants*, ever haunts your loyal breast. Let me here remind you, that *Atheism* has always flourished most, by the side of the Roman shrine; and where the Bible has been opened on the human mind, there truth and order, like the sun, has arisen and shone upon the people. Compare Scotland with Spain; Holland with Italy; Prussia with Portugal; England with France; our own country with the Mexican or South American States. What has made the immense difference! *The Bible*, read without restraint, and multiplied without limit, and preached with boldness and fidelity to a thinking people. Having no space now for this topic, I promise, in future numbers, to give you ample proof of the intimate union between Romanism and infidelity, and Romanism and extreme heresy.

You slip the case of the "collier" with far nearer approaches to profanity than right reasoning. It is possible "your rule of faith may be fallible;" or your collier may be "deranged," when he begins to *inquire* and *think*, after the slumber of his faculties for some half a century, under the Roman anodyne of *implicit faith*. But surely it ought never to be made an alternative in a proposition, that "JESUS CHRIST WAS A JUGGLER!" Suppose, however, you apply the illustration to any other book, say the creed of Pius IV. or the "Book of Bulls," or "The Fathers." Has language not a fixed meaning? Are there not plain rules for its interpretation? Can we not understand a book, because one man says it means this, and another *that*, and a third *something else?* And must we call the Bible a *fallible guide*, because some men may, and will, *wrest* it! Must we pin our faith to the Pope's sleeve, because *we* are liable to error! Yet this is all you have to say in defence of implicit faith. The sum of it is this—that the collier does (even as we have said,) *believe what he is told, and because he is told it; but it is better to do so, than worse; and he will do worse if he thinks for himself!*

You next attempt an oblique defence of your rule from the many objections which I have brought against it. In the fifth column, third paragraph, you say, "articles of faith and morals are the only objects of definition and transmission; neither does the church claim, nor has she exercised the right of creating new articles of faith." Now I ask, did not the Council of Trent make new articles of faith! Did she not order a new creed, containing these twelve articles, and binding all her communion to hold them, under pain of spiritual death! And were there not even new sacraments among these articles! I referred for proof to the *literary fraud* by which "*extreme unction*" was attempted to be made a sacrament, in your church standards. You are silent about it! What I have said above about Leo X's condemnation of Luther, plainly shows that you differ from him, and that he claimed the right not only to "*define*," but "*create*" articles of faith, and "*impose them on men for their belief.*" Transubstantiation, indulgences, taking the cup from the laity in the Lord's Supper, and *five* of your *seven* sacraments are palpable innovations; are new articles of faith, brought in by your church from age to age, and gathered up, and put into the creed, by the Council of Trent.

In your second answer "*to objections*," column 5th, you pass by the questions by saying, "*discipline* may vary." I suppose it is a point of discipline to forbid the use of the Scriptures; to restrict the freedom of the press; to claim the government of kingdoms; to establish the inquisition; to burn heretics; and encourage extended and bloody massacres; as of the Waldenses and Hugonots! Under this head too, I suppose you comprehend your apology for the "*ambitious projects*" of "*individual Popes.*" This is strange language! "Individual Popes!" And yet is this *all* you can reply to *all* I have brought from the Popes and from the councils, showing that your system is incompatible with personal and civil liberty! Your allusion to the Presbyterian minister now in the state-prison of New York, is legitimate. We mourn over such men—we depose them from their office; for we do not think with your church, that a man may, like Judas, be a *good Pope*, and yet a *bad man*. The history of your Popes is the blackest page of human story. The *moral* of "*bad man* and *good Pope*" reminds us of the Archbishop, (he was also a prince) who swore profanely in the presence of a peasant; the peasant exclaimed with surprise, "*Archbishop, do you swear?*" "No," he replied, "*I swear as a prince.*" "*Then*," said the peasant, "*When Satan comes for the prince, what will become of the archbishop?*"

I will refer to only one other evasion of yours. You answer my statement, that the Pope held a great anniversary at Rome, to bless all sorts of beasts (while he curses Bible Societies) with an unworthy levity about "*a similar operation over a good piece of beef.*" I have been accustomed to think that such a service was thanking God, *and asking his blessing on ourselves, not on the food we eat.* But the superstition and darkness of that Pontiff who can encourage such an anniversary, and the degraded condition of "the Mother and Mistress of churches," who can uphold such a celebration, remain still unexplained. If, however, the blessings were confined to *dead beasts*, and the anathemas removed from *living men who circulate the Bible*, it might be pitied, if not defended.

Your objections on the points of infant baptism, the change of the Sabbath, and the practices of our church as to the pastoral relation, surely have little to do with the rule of faith. The 1st and 2d come appropriately under the subject of tradition, on which you yet are silent. I will here only say that we find satisfactory proof for all the three practices in the word of God; or we would discard them. We reject not testimony which sustains our doctrines; (not opinions) but we look not to "*unwritten tradition*" for their support; and "if the candlestick of the Roman angel were removed to-morrow," we lose not a jot of *proof* on any subject, except that of the *depravity of man*. But more of this hereafter, when providence permitting, we hope to satisfy you in still further defending and illustrating the true rule of faith, i. e. the *Holy Spirit speaking in the Bible.*

I have been informed that Bishop Kenrick did, on the 17th of February last, in St. Mary's church, (Philadelphia) publicly warn the people against reading this controversy. I ask, is this true or not! If it be, it is not only a manifest interference, but a portentous intimation. I remain, Sir, yours, &c.

JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

MIS-STATEMENT CORRECTED.

Perceiving in the letter of the Rev. John Breckinridge, (No. 6 of the Controversy,) the following paragraph, I deem it due to the public, as well as to myself, to give it the earliest and most unequivocal contradiction.

"I have been informed that Bishop Kenrick did, on the 17th February last, in St. Mary's church, (Philadelphia) publicly warn the people against reading this controversy."

Not having on that, or any other occasion, made the remotest allusion to the pending controversy, and not having even in private, given to any individual whatever, any such warning, I declare the information to be utterly groundless. Given under my hand this 13th day of March, 1833.

† FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK,
Bp. &c.

WESTERN LUMINARY.

LEXINGTON, KY.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1833.

THE PRESBYTERIAN PREACHER, for March, is occupied with a Sermon by the *Rev. Ashbel G. Fairchild*, of Pennsylvania. Subject, "The Sovereignty of God, especially in Election." Text, Luke 4: 28–30.

THE FOREIGN MISSIONARY CHRONICLE.—This is the title of a periodical, designed to be monthly, issued in the pamphlet form, by the Western Foreign Missionary Society. Our readers will recollect, that this Society was established more than a year since, in the Synod of Pittsburgh. The work is to be conducted by the *Rev. Elisha P. Swift*, Corresponding Secretary of the Society; and is to contain a particular account of the proceedings of the Western Foreign Missionary Society, and a general view of the transactions of other similar institutions. The No. before us contains, 1. Introductory Remarks; 2. Circular Address of the Executive Committee of the Western Foreign Missionary Society; 3. Correspondence of Missionaries; 4 Missions of the Society; 5. Proceedings of the Executive Committee; 6. Memoirs of Barr; 7. Systematic Co-operation; 8. Juvenile Benevolence; 9. Donations for the last half year; 10. Terms of Publication, &c.

This publication is to be sent gratuitously to the Pastors of such congregations as statedly contribute to the funds of the Society; to the officers of all Auxiliary Societies; and to the active friends of the Society wherever desired. Others ordering it, will be expected to pay the sum of fifty cents per year.

The Society has received, in Donations and Contributions, from September 14, 1832, to March 14, 1833, $3534 65 1-2 cents.

We learn from the Cincinnati papers, that the *Rev. J. T. Russell* has resigned his office of General Agent and Corresponding Secretary of the General Assembly's Board of Missions.

HIGHLY COMMENDABLE.—The citizens of Andover, and several other towns in Massachusetts, have held public meetings, at which it was voted, by large majorities, that the authorities that have the granting of licences, to sell ardent spirit, should be instructed to grant no licence to any individual to sell spirituous liquors in any way.

AMERICAN COLONIZATION SOCIETY.—This benevolent institution is steadily progressing in its means of usefulness, and is every day gaining a stronger hold upon the affections of the great mass of our population. A gentleman of New-Orleans, lately deceased, has left by his will, one third of his estate to the Society. The whole estate is estimated at thirty thousand dollars. We stated a short time since, that the Legislature of Virginia have appropriated $90,000, to be paid in five annual instalments, in aid of the same noble scheme of benevolence. Will not such examples as these, awaken a corresponding feeling in the hearts of those patriots and philanthropists who have it in their power to advance the interests of this truly Christian enterprize! Were every individual in our country who feels friendly to the cause of African Colonization, to use those means during the present year, for the promotion of the work, which he could do with a very slight sacrifice of ease or money, what blessed results would ensue to our own country and to the grossly injured land from whence our coloured population were originally torn. Does not humanity, does not justice plead for such efforts from the virtuous and benevolent! Shall they be withheld!

TEMPERANCE.—We are gratified to learn, that the example set by the members of Congress at its last session, in the formation of a Congressional Temperance Society, has already been imitated by the members of the Legislature of Massachusetts. We hope the time is not distant, when every Legislative body in the United States will have its Temperance Society.

The meeting at which the Society alluded to was formed, was held in the Hall of the House of Representatives of the Massachusetts Legislature, on the 15th of last month. The meeting was addressed, in support of a number of resolutions, by distinguished gentlemen. A Constitution was adopted, substantially the same as that of the Congressional Temperance Society. The style of the Society is, "The Massachusetts Legislative Temperance Society."

THE LOTTERY SYSTEM.—A pamphlet 48 pages has been issued in Philadelphia, entitled "A brief Survey of the great extent and evil tendencies of the Lottery System, as existing in the United States." It is published by order of a meeting of the citizens of Philadelphia. *Five thousand* copies are to be gratuitously distributed throughout the United States. The thrilling facts contained in this seasonable publication, cannot fail to exert a powerful influence on the public mind, against one of the most pernicious evils which has ever cursed our land.

We learn that there are *two hundred* Lottery offices in Philadelphia, and that the pecuniary loss to its citizens, by that means, is *thirty thousand dollars* weekly!! *Is it not time for our Legislators to awake on this subject!*

TEMPERANCE AMONG SEAMEN.—An interesting meeting has lately been held in the city of New-York, for the promotion of Temperance among the Seamen of that port. After the delivery of appropriate addresses, a Constitution was adopted, and officers were elected. *Seventy* individuals came forward, and affixed their names, as members of the Society.

NEW PUBLICATION.—Proposals have been issued by George W. Light & Co. of Boston, to publish in that city a periodical work, to be entitled "*The Colonizationalist and Journal of Freedom.*" It is to appear in monthly numbers, of 32 pages each, at $2 per year. This publication, says the Prospectus, "will be devoted primarily to the exposition and support of the principles and plans of the American Colonization Society."

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF MISSIONS,
Philadelphia, March 8th, 1833.

TO MISSIONARIES.—As it is the duty of the Board to lay a full and satisfactory report of all that they have been enabled to accomplish, during the year, before the General Assembly, at their sessions in May; so it is essential to the fullness and correctness of the Report, that our Missionaries should be full, explicit and punctual in forwarding their several *Special Reports* to the Board, at the time mentioned in their commissions.

All the Missionaries of the Board, therefore, are requested, *without fail*, on the first of April next, to prepare and forward immediately, a *Special Report*, addressed to the *Corresponding Secretary of the G. A. Board of Missions*, 29 *Sansom street, Philadelphia*, embracing in it the following particulars;—

1. Date of Commission, and the precise amount of labour performed from April 1st, 1832, to April 1st, 1833, or to the close of their commissions, if they have expired before the latter date.

2. The number of congregations and missionary stations supplied, and the number of families in each.

3. The number of additions to the church on examination, or on certificate; of baptisms; and the total in communion.

4. The number of churches organized, and houses of worship erected.

5. The number of Sabbath Schools, Catechetical and Bible Classes, and the number of teachers and learners in each.

6. The number of Bible, Tract, Missionary, Education, Temperance, and Colonization Societies.

7. The amount raised for Foreign and Domestic Missions, and the number of Missionary Societies auxiliary to the Board.

8. The whole number of Sermons preached, Monthly Concerts attended, prayer-meetings established, and families visited.

NOTICE TO AUXILIARIES.—Auxiliary Societies are respectfully and earnestly requested to have their annual collections for the Board of Missions completed as speedily as possible,—and all Treasurers and Agents to whom funds have been committed for the use of the Board, are also requested to forward to our Treasurer, *Solomon Allen, Esq.*, No. 117 Chesnut street, Philadelphia, an accurate statement of the amounts they have received, and the particular sources from which they were derived. At the same time, they will please, if practicable, to forward the full amount of money collected; and with a view of the increasing demands for missionary labour, and the still augmenting responsibility of the Board, we beseech them, as fellow labourers with us in the same holy cause, that they would use their influence to obtain additional subscriptions and pledges for the ensuing year.

Meeting for Foreign Missions in Washington.

City of Washington, March 4, 1833.

Dear Brother Leavitt—A meeting was held last night in the first Presbyterian church, in favor of the A. B. C. F. M. Hon. Mr. Sergeant, of Philadelphia, was called to the chair, and the Hon. Mr. Denny, a member of Congress, was appointed Secretary. The meeting was opened with prayer by Rev. Dr. Laurie, of our city, and a number of soul-stirring addresses were delivered. Mr. Proudfit, of Massachusetts, made a statement of interesting facts respecting the operations of the Board and the success which had attended all their efforts. He said that the Board had resolved to send out *fifty missionaries* during the present year, if the churches would furnish them with means. He was followed by the Rev. Mr. Gurley, Secretary of the Am. Col. Society, who dwelt at some length on the command of our Saviour, "to do to others as we would that others should do to us." He spoke of "the propriety of christian *governments* engaging in the great work of extending the blessings of the christian religion over the whole world." If all the subjects of a government were christians there might be a propriety in employing the resources and energies of the government in such a work. But while the majority of the nation is lying in wickedness, as well as "the whole world," the greatest evil which could befal the cause of christian benevolence would be a reliance upon the arm of government. The world is to be subjected to Christ, if I understand the Bible, by the private benefactions, and self-denying efforts of *praying christians*—not by any union between church and state, or by any showy and splendid efforts of mighty nations. A dependence upon any thing, but the exertions of *christians* and the accompanying power of God's Spirit, will ensure defeat and ruin. There is no such thing as *protection* of the christian religion by any arm but that of its founder. A state protect religion! a government support and extend christianity! as well might the vulture, as he lights upon the lamb, cry protection and support, and as he soars away declare, it is my kind power which protects you from falling and dashing upon the rock beneath, while at the same time he is feeding upon its life blood.

Mr. Gurley was succeeded by Rev. Mr. Lowrie, a son of the Secretary of the U. S. Senate, who is soon to leave this country for a foreign field, under the direction of the Western F. M. Society. In the course of his remarks, he said that the way in which his own mind was most deeply affected by the condition of those who are without the blessings of the gospel, was *by placing himself in their condition*, as without a Bible, without a Saviour, deprived of all the hopes and consolations which the religion of Christ affords, then asking himself the question—"*what should I desire christians to do for me in their condition?* If there were more of this *Bible reasoning*, Mr. Editor, on the subject of personal effort, and sacrifices, in the cause of Foreign Missions, the cause would never want for money or men.

Hon. Mr. Frelinghuysen then rose. This gentleman is always at home in the Senate, powerful in argument, striking in illustration, and exhibits the candor and fearlessness of one who has a "conscience void of offence" towards God and man. But in the cause where the honor of the Son of God is concerned he feels and reasons as if religion was his element. His soul takes fire whenever he approaches the subject of christian benevolence, and his appeals to his fellow christians on occasions like the present are uncommonly animated and impressive.

He chained the attention of the audience for about half an hour. He spoke of Foreign Missions generally, of the success which had attended the efforts of missionaries, carried us to the Sandwich Islands, brought before us the inestimable blessings which had been conferred upon those islands by christian missions, enlarged upon the present operations of the Board, and concluded by offering a resolution to the following effect: "That the American churches repose the most entire confidence in the A. B. C. F. M., and are willing to give them all necessary support in their attempts to convert the world."

The resolutions and speeches will probably be published, as there was a reporter present who took them down while the gentlemen were speaking. A collection was then taken up of $250, a large collection for Washington. While they were taking up the collection, a letter was read from Hon. Wm. Wirt, excusing his absence on account of ill health, and pledging to the cause of foreign missions his warmest support. "The kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ." Let christians rejoice and go forward and the work is done.

[*N. Y. Evan.*] Yours truly, ELBON.

Georgia and the Missionaries.

The Missionary Herald for the present month contains a very full and lucid statement of the course pursued by Messrs. Worcester and Butler, and particularly of the circumstances that led to their release; which we commend to the attention of any who may suppose that there has been any sacrifice of principle on their part, or any waving of rights, not dictated by the most honorable views and feelings. It is worthy of remark,—and the fact ought to prevent hasty censures, from any who may not be *fully* acquainted with the circumstances—that, while the missionaries have acted entirely on their own responsibility from the first, without direction or even advice from the Prudential Committee,—not however without a free interchange of views on all important questions—and while the latter have acted with entire unanimity, it is not known that, at any stage of the business, the judgment of the Committe has differed from that of the missionaries. The missionaries did not accept pardon; they made no acknowledgements or concessions as the price of freedom.—*Boston Rec.*

"They have yielded, (says the Herald,) none of the principles involved in these motives for the course of conduct they have pursued. They have not yielded the point, that they had originally a right to prosecute, unmolested, their labors among the Cherokees; that their views of the constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States, under which they acted, were correct; that they were right in appealing from the decision of the court of Georgia to the Supreme Court; that they had a just claim to immediate and unconditional release from imprisonment, in compliance with the decision and mandate of that Court; and that they might justly claim the further interposition of that Court for their deliverance according to the course of law.

"Nor have they stopped short of accomplishing every object aimed at by them, which in their view, could possibly be accomplished by them, even if they should carry their suit to the utmost extremity. The law, under which their labors had been interrupted and their persons imprisoned, had been repealed, so that, by their discharge they are able, without delay or fear of further molestation, to resume their missionary labors. The Supreme Court, in giving an opinion in the case of the missionaries, have incidentally, but fully and explicitly, given an opinion respecting the meaning of the treaties and laws which have been made for protecting the rights of the Cherokees, sustaining them in all which they have claimed. Whether this unhappy people will be reinstated in these rights, in conformity with the opinion of the Court, will be matter for future history to record.—The Court, also, by deciding unequivocally, in the face of the country, that the missionaries, in the controversy with the state of Georgia, had right and justice on their side, and that they had been arrested and imprisoned contrary to the constitution and laws of the Union, have done all that the highest judicial tribunal in the nation could do to rescue their character from ignominy and reproach. In the present posture of our national affairs, it did not seem practicable to the missionaries, or to the Committee, to gain more. The ultimate result of this protracted and painful controversy, with prayerful and humble reliance on the wisdom of the divine administration, must be left with him, on whose hands the name of Zion is engraved, and who will cause *all things to work together for good to those that love him.*"

American Bible Society.

COMING ANNIVERSARY.

The seventeenth anniversary of the American Bible Society will be celebrated in New-York on Thursday the ninth of May next; the meeting commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M.

In view of the approaching celebration referred to above, it is important that those Auxiliaries which have not made reports the present year, should do so now, by the first or middle of April. Where a formal report cannot be sent, the secretary of each society is requested to furnish us with a letter, giving an account of their condition and prospects, and the names of their respective Presidents, Secretaries, and Treasurers. This is highly desirable, in order for the Managers of the Parent Society to make their report.—*Monthly Extracts, March, 1833.*

Foreign News.

From the New-York Observer.

By an arrival at this port London papers have been received to the 4th of February.

The most important news is that a great and decisive battle was fought on the plains of Koniah on the 21st of November, between the Turkish and Egyptian armies, the former commanded by the Grand Vizier in person, and the latter by Ibrahim, the son of Mehemet Ali; pacha of Egypt. The result was the complete overthrow of the Turks, and the capture of the Grand Vizier, after a sanguinary conflict. Nothing but the interference of the European powers, it was supposed, could prevent Ibrahim from entering Constantinople, and the absorbing questions in all political circles were, what will be the course of Russia, Austria, France and England in this new state of affairs in the East.

The British parliament assembled on the 29th of January. The House of Commons re-elected Mr. Charles Manners Sutton speaker, by a majority of 210, the vote being for Mr. Sutton 241, for Mr. Littleton 31.

The question of the abolition of slavery in the West Indies produced intense excitement in London. It was rumored that ministers had declared their intention of bringing forward a bill for the emancipation of all slaves, within a period of three years, without compensation to the owners, and that 15,000 troops would forthwith be sent to the West Indies.

A convention of the Clergy of the Church of England was convened on the 30th of January at the Chapter House, at St. Paul's, by a mandate of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The meeting was opened with much form and ceremony.

Murder and outrages of the most appalling character had become every day occurrences in Ireland, and it was believed that the Government were preparing to send 20,000 additional troops from England to preserve the peace.

The death of that pious and venerable lady, Mrs. Hannah More, was hourly expected. She is 84 years of age.

The new African expedition had arrived with the Landers, at Accra on the Gold coast, but had been unable to proceed onwards on account of a violent quarrel between the commanders.

Among the deaths is that of Lord Exmouth, the hero of Algiers. He was in his sixty-eight year, was a violent Tory and voted against the Reform Bills.

It is stated that one-fifth of the slave population of the island of St. Helana has been already emancipated, and that in the course of four or five years a slave will not be found on that island.

The London Standard contains a statement that the German Diet has refused to permit the annexation of the Duchy of Luxemburg to Belgium.

Accounts from Naples, to the 25d of Dec. state that on the two previous days the eruptions of Mount Vesuvius had been most violent. Continual explosions were plainly heard at Naples.

The property destroyed during the recent dreadful fire at Liverpool is now estimated at a quarter of a million. The insurance on it does not exceed £140,000.

WEST INDIES.

Earthquakes at Nevis and St. Kitts.

Captain Flint, of the British schooner Brisk, at Wilmington, N. C. from Nevis, reports, that on the night of the 8th of February, the Islands of Nevis and St. Kitts, experienced sixteen violent and distinct shocks of Earthquakes, which very much alarmed the inhabitants; and on the 9th, after the B. was under way, at 4 o'clock, experienced a considerable shock. It is to be feared that dreadful accounts will be received from these Islands, or some of the neighboring ones, from the effects of these earthquakes.

JAMAICA.

A new and general ferment has been occasioned in the Island of Jamaica, by the publication of a Royal Proclamation issued by the King of England, and accompanied by a circular from the Earl of Mulgrave, the Governor, prohibiting the formation or action of any Societies for the forcible removal from the Island of the Dissenting Teachers and Ministers of Religion. His Majesty declares his intention to maintain and defend the principles of religious toleration throughout all his dominions, and warns all persons not to transgress the injuctions of his proclamation at their peril.

Summary.

ADVANCE OF THE WEST.—A gentleman from Cincinnati, has furnished us with the following schedule of prices there in the year 1819 and the year 1833. In 1819 the currency was at a discount from specie of 30 per cent. At that time barges were from three to four months in coming up from New-Orleans, and freight was five cents a pound. Now the steamboats come up in eight or ten days, and freight is three fourths of a cent a pound. If the West had any resources of a pecuniary nature in 1819, those resources must be immensely greater now.

Prices at Cincinnati in the year 1819 and 1833.

IMPORTS.—	Mackeral, No. 1,	brl.	$40	$8 1-8
	Carriers Oil.	do.	$60	$18
	Rosin.	do.	$16	$2 1-8
	Coffee.	lb.	33 cts.	14 cts.
	Loaf Sugar.	lb.	33 cts.	14 cts.
	N. Orleans Sugar.	lb.	17 cts.	7 1-2
EXPORTS.—	Flour.	brl.	$1 3-8	$4 1-4
	Corn.	bus.	10a12c.	30 cts.
	Pork.	lb.	1 1-2 cts.	3 cts.
	Whiskey.	gal.	14 cts.	26cts.

J. of Commerce.

By a statement in the Philadelphia Commercial Herald, it appears that the chartered capital of Banks in that city, 16 in number, amounts to $26,600,000—the sum paid in, is $18,935,000. The Insurance Companies, fourteen in number, have a capital of $5,030,000.

It is said that there are now on the stocks in the United States, one hundred and thirty ships, averaging more than 350 tons each. Of this number, upwards of 70 are being built east of Boston.

The Ancient Landmark Masonic Lodge, of Caledona, Vermont, has surrendered its charter—appropriated its funds to the Colonization Society—and dissolved itself into its original elements.

An Anti-Tobacco Society has recently been formed in Ulster county, N. Y. About fifty persons have pledged themselves to discountenance the use of the narcotic. In future they will *ex*-chew Tobacco.

MARRIED—On Thursday evening last, Mr. JOHN WILSON of this city, to Miss ELIZA M. HULL, daughter of Mr. Jacob Hull of Fayette County.

DIED—In Georgetown, on Thursday last, Mr. WILLIAM HEWETT, at a very advanced age.

In this city, on Thursday last, PHŒBE CATHARINE WOOD, daughter of Mr. Ben. C. Wood.

In this city, on Saturday last, Mr. JOHN S. WALKER.

—— On Sunday, 31st, Mr. WILLIAM VIRDEN.

FEMALE SCHOOL.

THE next Session of SYLVAN ACADEMY, near Salem church, Clarke Co. Ky. will commence on the first day of May next.

O. S. HINCKLEY.

April 1, 1833.—39-4t.

FEMALE SCHOOL.

THE Summer Session of the School for Young Ladies at Judge Robbins's will commence on the 15th day of April next, being the 3d Monday. Board, Tuition, Washing, &c. $50 per session. Music, Drawing and Painting charged separately.

Montgomery county, March 18, 1833.—38-6w*

Splendid Cloths & Cassimeres.

DRAKE & FRAZER,

No. 76, Main-Street, Lexington, Kentucky.

ARE are just receiving a large and splendid supply of FASHIONABLE GOODS, suitable for the present and approaching season,

AMONG WHICH ARE

Super Blue, Black and Polish Mixed Cloths; Auburn, French, and German Browns; Invisible and Olive Greens; Mulberry, Claret, and Olive Browns; Single and Double Milled Cassimeres, of the most fashionable colors; Superior French Bombazines; Fashionable Striped Nankeens and Drillings; Gum Elastic Silk and Net Suspenders; Silk and Cotton Half Hose; Superior Gloves, Stocks, Shirt Collars, Cravats, and Pocket Handkerchiefs; Fine Linen Ready Made Shirts and Shirtees; a large supply of Fashionable Vestings; Walking Sticks and Umbrellas; Visiting Cards, and Curls; and a variety of fancy articles, which we hope our friends will call and see, and intend selling them low for cash, as they have all been purchased by one of the concern who has just returned from Philadelphia and New-York.

Latest Fashions Just Received.

☞ Our work shall be executed in the best and most fashionable style.

Lexington, March 27—38-tf.

Miscellaneous.

LETTER TO AN OPULENT PROFESSOR ON THE APPLICATION OF PROPERTY.

[*From the London Evangelical Magazine.*]

All that we know of the following letter is, that it was written on a particular occasion, and addressed to a gentleman in the circumstances referred to. But who the writer was, to whom addressed, and what was its effect, we are not informed.—Though originally quite confidential (as every such communication ought to be,) we consider it no violation of that confidence to give it publicity, as there is no allusion either to the writer or the person to whom it was sent; and, as the suggestions contained in it are, we believe, applicable to many wealthy professors of religion, we hope its publication may be useful.

My Dear Sir—I have long thought that one of the most important services which one professing Christian can perform to another, is faithfully to point out to him whatever may appear in his habits or conduct at all inconsistent with the Christian character. This is a kind of fidelity which, I fear, is not often to be met with; but if it were more generally exercised, and received in a proper spirit, it would tend much to remove many of those inconsistences which we find among professors, and which so often fortify worldly men in the neglect of the gospel, and cause them to speak reproachfully.

You will at once, I dare say, apprehend that this is a preface to my exercising a little of that fidelity which I so much approve. It is; and be assured that it is with no feeling but that of the most sincere Christian regard, that I express my regret at the observation I have heard made, respecting the limited scale on which you appear to contribute to advance the cause of the gospel, when compared with your well knowm ample fortune. Perhaps you say you give privately. If you say so, I do not question it; and if it be in some fair proportion to your means, it is well. But I appeal to yourself, if, in this case, you do not mistake the path of duty. Many do not distinguish between *ostestation* and *publicity*, when they quote that text, "Do not give your alms to be seen of men." It is the former, not the latter, our Lord here condemns. We are called to watch over our motives, to see that we do not give alms *in order* to be seen of men. On the other hand, *publicity* in acts of benevolence, is inculcated in the precept, "Let your light so shine before men that they, seeing your good works, may glorify your Father who is in Heaven." Now, how are we to glorify God, by others seeing our good works, unless they really do see them? An opulent Christian is expressly called to set an example of the way in which property ought to be used for the glory of God. Not that others are not called to do so likewise. But a wealthy Christian stands on vantage ground. In the good providence of God he has it much more in his power than others, by being able to do things on a larger scale, to show how he considers property as a talent committed to his trust, and which he is called to employ, according to the measure in which it is bestowed, for the glory of the church.

Now I hold that with every Christian, it ought to be a matter of serious and conscientious inquiry, Am I, as in the sight of God, employing the property he has given me, to the extent to which I ought, in relieving the distresses of others, and in promoting the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom? No one will deny that such a question every Christian ought to put; and the plain rule of Scripture is, to give *as the Lord hath prospered us*. There must evidently be a proportion between what we *give* and what we *possess;* and while no express measure of that proportion is mentioned, as the situation of individuals is very various, we should endeavor to discover, from the whole spirit of the gospel, what duty, in our particular circumstances, requires. I should tremble at the thought of being found on a death bed, or at the judgment-seat, to have retained any part of that which I ought to have given for the glory of God in the world. Were this kept in view by many who profess the religion of Christ, there would be no complaint of want of funds for promoting, far more extensively than is at present done, the interests of his kingdom.

But where one who professes our orthodox creed, and is even perhaps strenuous in the defence of it, is never seen to contribute, except on a very limited scale (limited for him at least) for purposes of Christian benevolence, there is far more injury done than from the mere want of his pecuniary aid. It creates a prejudice in the minds of men against the very creed he holds. He is apt to be accountered not very-sincere in his professed zeal for divine truth, while that zeal does not more effectually reach his pocket. I have often heard with regret those who made no particular profession declare, they could not bear to hear such persons speak about religion, while it was manifest it had so little influence on their conduct, as they were plainly as much attached to the world as those who made no such pretensions.

It is but the part of Christian fidelity to say that I have heard these or similar remarks made in reference to yourself. I have heard them made by those who were connected with you in church-fellowship, and in closer habits of intimacy than I am. I have told such persons what their duty was in such a case. But it is from having reason to fear, that what they so readily expressed to others, they had not the honesty to express to yourself, that I have felt it my duty to write you this letter.

I have now performed, my dear sir, what, from our long acquaintance, I felt to be a duty, though far from a pleasant one. Believing that you and I are travelling together to the judgment seat of Christ, should it be found, when we appear there, that you had been living in the neglect of an important part of the will of the Judge, and that, though I had reason to fear that this was the case, I had not pointed out to you the evil, I should certainly be found not to have treated you with that fidelity with which it becomes one professing Christian to act towards another; there can at least be no harm in bringing this subject under your notice. If you think I have judged severely, forgive me this wrong. If you knew the sincere Christian regard, and the earnest desire that you may appear at last accepted of God, by which I am influenced in writing you, I am confident you could not be offended at this communication.

In conclusion, I would simply say, I invite you to make reprisals. You may find in me as great inconsistencies in some other things, as I have endeavored to point out in you. If you do, I will cordially thank you to mention them. Whatever unhallowed feelings might at the moment spring up, (feelings to which we are all too subject when any thing is presented to us in the form of reproof,) I trust I shall ever consider it the highest favor that you or any one can do me, in the spirit of the gospel to guard me against evils into which, from the deceitfulness of the heart, I am apt to be betrayed.

With the very best wishes for you and yours, and earnestly praying that we may be directed in our different spheres, in all things to walk so as to please God, I am, my dear Sir,

Yours, &c.

From Blackwood's Magazine.

THE TRAVELLER'S ENENING SONG.

By Mrs. Hemans.

Father, guide me! Day declines,
Hollow winds are in the pines;
Darkly waves each giant-bough
O'er the sky's last crimson glow;
Hush'd is now the convent's bell,
Which erewhile with breezy swell
From the purple mountains bore
Greeting to the sunset-shore.
Now the sailor's vesper-hymn
Dies away.
Father! in the forest dim
Be my stay!

In the low and shivering thrill
Of the leaves, that late hung still;
In the dull and muffled tone
Of the sea-wave's distant moan;
In the deep tints of the sky,
There are signs of tempest nigh.
Ominous, with sullen sound,
Falls the closing dusk around,
Father! through the storm and shade
O'er the wild,
Oh! be *Thou* the lone one's aid—
Save thy child!

Many a swift and sounding plume
Homewards, through the boding gloom,
O'er my way hath flitted fast,
Since the farewell sunbeam passed
From the chesnut's ruddy bark,
And the pools now low and dark,
Where the wakening night winds sigh
Through the long reeds mournfully.
Homeward, homeward, all things haste—
God of might!
Shield the homeless midst the waste,
Be his light!

In his distant cradle-nest,
Now my babe is laid to rest;
Beautiful his slumber seems
With a glow of heavenly dreams,
Beautiful o'er that bright sleep,
Hang soft eyes of fondness deep,
Where his mother bends to pray,
For the loved and far away.
Father! guard that household bower,
Hear that prayer!
Back, through thine all-guiding power,
Lead me there!

Darker, wilder, grows the night—
Not a star sends quivering light
Through the massy arch of shade
By the stern old forest made.
Thou! to whose unslumbering eyes
All my pathway open lies,
By thy Son, who knew distress
In the lonely wilderness,
Where no roof to that blest head
Shelter gave—
Father! through the time of dread,
Save, oh! save!

HAPPINESS.

If solid happiness we prize,
Within our breast this jewel lies,
And they are fools who roam:
The world has nothing to bestow,
From our own selves our joys must flow,
And that dear hut our home.

Benefits of Adversity.—A smooth sea, never made a skilful mariner; neither does uninterrupted prosperity and success qualify us for usefulness and happiness. The storms of adversity, like the storms of the ocean, arouse the faculties, excite the invention, prudence, skill, and fortitude of the voyager. The martyrs and confessors of ancient times, in bracing their minds to outward calamity, acquired a loftiness of purpose, a moral heroism, that was worth a life of softiness and security.

Christ's Riches.—Christ is a pearl, which whoever hath can never be poor, and which whoever wants can never be poor. Christ's riches are so many, they cannot be numbered; they are so precious, they cannot be valued; they are so great they cannot be measured.—Dyer.

Anger.—An ancient philosopher, whose servant boy had committed a fault, said to him, "I should have beaten you for this, had I not been angry."

CENTRE COLLEGE.

THE Summer Session of Centre College, will commence on the 25th day of April, 1833, and continue Twenty-one weeks, when the Annual Commencement will be held, for conferring degress.

TO THE PUBLIC.

As the Trustees of Centre College have, at length, been enabled fully to organize their Institution, by doubling the number of its officers and greatly enlarging the course of instruction; and as frequent calls are made upon them from persons at a distance, requesting information in relation to the course of studies, number of officers, expenses, &c. of the College; they have determined to publish, for the satisfaction of their friends and the public, the following expose, which will exhibit every thing that would probably be interesting to any one who may wish to select a place for the education of his sons.

I. CHARTER.

Centre College was incorporated by a Special Act of the Legislature of Kentucky, in the year 1818. The immunities and privileges conferred on it by this act, are, in all respects, equal to those enjoyed by any Literary Institution in the State. Its affairs are managed by a Board of eleven Trustees, appointed, from time to time, by the Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky. It is the only College, in the State, that belongs by charter to the Presbyterian Church. The Legislature gave up all control over its concerns, and surrendered it into the hands of the Synod in consideration of their endowing it without legislative assistance. The charter, however, stipulates that no sectarian peculiarities shall be taught by the Professors, and that all sects are to have free access for their children to the Institution.

II. PROFESSORS.

Rev. JOHN C. YOUNG, A. M. President, *Professor of Logic, Moral and Mental Philosophy.*
JAMES M. BUCHANAN, A. M. *Professor of Mathematics.*
Rev. WILLIAM L. BRECKINRIDGE, A. M. *Professor of Ancient Languages.*
LEWIS W. GREEN, A. M. *Professor of Belles Lettres and Political Economy.*
LUKE MUNSELL, M. D. *Professor of Chemistry, Mineralogy and Natural Philosophy.*
Rev. JOSEPH HUBER, *Professor of Modern Languages.*
WILLIAM Y. ALLEN, HENRY G. COMMINGO, } *Tutors of the Grammar School.*

One of these Professors will be Rector of the Grammar School, and spend in its instruction and supervision at least one hour, each day.

The number of Professors is arger than in any other College in the West; and all of them, except one, devote their whole time to their Professional duties. The Professor of Modern Languages is occupied in instruction only during the winter session, as the studies of his Department are attended to in that part of the year.

III. GOVERNMENT.

The government of the College is paternal. The students enjoy a greater degree of familiar intercourse with their Professors, than is customary at similar Institutions. Such intercourse, it is believed, can effect more than formal and official instructions in training youth to propriety of conduct, and inspiring them with correct moral sentiments. It is the desire and aim of the Faculty to supersede, as far as possible, the necessity of discipline, by keeping up, among the youth, so strong a public sentiment in favor of virtue and religion, as will check all attempts at disorder, and subdue and change the dispositions of those who may be inclined to idleness and immorality. Hitherto they have witnessed, with pleasure, the success of this plan; whole sessions having sometimes passed away without a single cause of discipline. When the example and sentiments of his fellow-students, the private counsels and affectionate exhortations of the Professors, and the public censure of the Faculty have all been tried without effecting the reformation of an idle or immoral youth, he is dismissed and sent home to his friends, that his influence may not be exerted in corrupting others.

IV. COURSE OF STUDY.

GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Latin, Greek, and English Grammars, Latin Prosody, Mair's Introduction, Arithmetic, Geography, Latin Reader, Cæsar, Ovid, Sallust, Jacob's Greek Reader.

FRESHMAN CLASS.

First Term.—Virgil's Æneid, Translation of English into Latin, Xenophon's Cyropædia, Roman Antiquities, (Adams') Algebra, Declamation, Bible Recitation.

Second Term.—Livy, Translation of English into Latin, Græca Majora, Greek Antiquities. Ancient Geography, Algebra continued, Declamation, Bible Recitations.

SOPHOMORE CLASS.

First Term.—Virgil's Georgics and Bucolics, Cicero's Orations, Homer, Legendre's Geometry, Composition, Declamation, Instructions and Exercises in Reading, Bible Recitation.

Second Term.—Horace, Græca Majora (Oratorical and Philosophical Extracts) Geometry continued, Declamation, Composition, Reading Lessons, Bible Recitation.

JUNIOR CLASS.

First Term.—Cicero de Oratore, Græca Majora, (Critical and Miscellaneous Extracts,) Longinus, Greek Testament, (Epistles,) Rhetoric, Elements of Criticism, Critical Examination of some English Classics, Logic, Trigonometry, (Plane and Spherical,) Original Speeches, Composition, Bible Recitation.

Second Term.—Juvenal, Græca Majora, 2d vol. (Epic Extracts) Evidences of Christianity, Political Economy, Conic Sections, Application of Algebra to Geometry and Trigonometry, Original Speeches, Composition, Bible Recitation.

SENIOR CLASS.

First Term.—Tacitus, (or Cicero de Officiis) Græca Majora, (Dramatic Extracts,) Hebrew or French, Mental Philosophy, Chemistry, Natural Philosophy, Original Speeches, Composition, Bible Recitation.

Second Term.—Cicero de Amicitia and de Senectute, Græca Majora, (finished) Moral Philosophy, Astronomy, Geology, Mineralogy, Original Speeches, Composition, Bible Recitation.

An opportunity will be afforded to any, who may wish it, to study the German, Spanish, or Italian language, as well as the French. The Professor of Modern Languages is a European by birth, has resided in the different countries whose languages he teaches, and has been in the habit of conversing in those languages.

The studies here laid down, must be mastered to entitle any student to a Diploma. In many Institutions the apparent or printed course is very different from the course actually pursued. The one is very diffuse, and the other very contracted.—The Trustees deem it, therefore, proper to say, that they have not chalked out an ideal desirable course, but an attainable one which shall be fully taught. The course will be modified from time to time, to keep pace with the general advancement of knowledge. Of these changes, due notice will be given in the annual publications of the Board.

As many desire to study only particular branches of science, such persons are admitted into College as Irregular Students to pursue the specific course they desire. Irregular students will, however, be required to conform to the general rules of the Institution. Persons desirous of qualifying themselves for teaching common schools, will be furnished with an opportunity of acquainting themselves with the various branches of higher English Education, and thus fitting themselves for greater usefulness and respectability in their profession.

The great object of the Instructers, will be, not so much to *infuse* their own knowledge into the minds of the youth, as to develop the powers of the pupils, teach them *how to acquire for themselves*, and thus store their minds with unborrowed attainments. Instead of making their pupils mere depositories of science, they will endeavour to make them thinking beings.

V. RELIGIOUS SERVICES.

All students are required to attend prayers in the Chapel, in the morning, before the instructions of the day commence; and in the evening, at the close. They are also required to attend a Bible Recitation on the Sabbath. When there is preaching in the Chapel on the Sabbath, the students must attend unless a parent or guardian shall intimate, in writing, his wish that his son or ward should attend preaching elsewhere. There are, in the town, houses of worship belonging to four different denominations of christians, the Presbyterian, Methodist, Episcopal, and Baptist. Any of these a parent or guardian may select for his son or ward's attendance; but it is required that each student attend regularly on some church.

VI. LIBRARY, APPARATUS, & READING ROOM.

The College Library consists of 1600 volumes, of very choice and valuable works; and additions are constantly making to the Library. There are also several society libraries, containing some hundred volumes. So that the student has access to about 2,300 volumes.

There is also a Reading Room, under the care of the Faculty, in the use of which students are allowed to participate. In this Room are found all the able Periodicals of our own country, and some of the best Foreign Journals.

As more attention is intended to be given to Chemistry and Natural Philosophy than has hitherto been paid to them in any Western College, the Board have not only appointed a Professor for this Department, but have procured, from the East a new and extensive apparatus, for fully exhibiting the various experiments necessary in a large course of Natural Science.

VII. COMMENCEMENT, VACATIONS, EXAMINATIONS.

The Annual Commencement takes place on the Thursday following the 3d Wednesday of September. A vacation immediately follows the Commencement, and continues until the Thursday after the 3d Wednesday of October. The winter Session, which is then opened, continues for twenty-one weeks, and is followed by another vacation of four weeks. The summer Session is then opened, and continues until the commencement. The examinations of the classes, are semi-annual, and occupy in the fall, three days immediately previous to the Commencement, and, in the Spring, the last two days of the Session. On the day previous to the Commencement, the Senior Class are examined for their degrees, on all the studies of their course.

VIII. TUITION FEE, &c.

The tuition fee is $15 per session in the College Proper, and $12 in the Preparatory. As it is very desirable that students should enter at the beginning of a Session, to commence their studies with their respective classes, no deduction from the tuition fee will be made in favor of any one who may enter after the commencement of a session, but before the first two months of it have expired. Those who may enter after the first two months of a session, will be charged in proportion to the part of it that still remains. The tuition fee for each session is paid in advance to the Treasurer of College, and nothing is refunded to any who may leave College before the close of the Session.

IX. EXPENSES.

It has been an object with the Board to make education as cheap as possible, that thus it might be accessible to all. The situation of the village in which the College is located has been very favourable to their wishes in this respect. For its distance from any large market-town, and the remarkable productiveness of the surrounding country render the means of subsistence uncommonly cheap. Every effort too, is used by the Faculty for encouraging a spirit of strict economy. A taste for dress and idle expenditure is, in every way, discouraged. Domestic manufacture is almost universally worn by teachers as well as pupils; and a plain neat dress is considered more creditable to its wearer than a costly one.

A student's expenses, vary here, as well as elsewhere, according to his previous tastes and habits. Some, by choosing to board at a cheaper rate than ordinary, and by economy in other points, can reduce their rate of expenditure much below what is the average.

The common price of boarding, washing and lodging in private families, is $1 50 per week, the student furnishing his own wood and candles. At a distance of a mile from College, boarding, &c. including wood and candles, can be procured for $1 00 per week.

If a student rooms in the college, he pays $2 50 per session, for room rent, and can procure boarding in the town, for from 87½ cents, to $1 18¾ per week.

The tuition fee is $30 per annum in the College Proper, and $24 in the Preparatory.

Exclusive of books and clothing, a student may support himself on from $80 to $100 per annum. Some indeed of our most respectable students live on from $65 to $80.

X. EDUCATION FARM.

There is a farm, in the immediate vicinity of College, on which, by laboring two hours per day, any young man having the gospel ministry in view, can live, covering every expense, except for books and clothing, by $60 per annum. The Board have it in contemplation to afford to any other students, besides those intended for the ministry, the opportunity of aiding themselves and benefitting their health by a system of manual labor.

XI. GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

In the Grammar School, youth are fitted for College, and also taught the higher branches of an English Education. The discipline is mild but strict. Idleness and misconduct are promptly punished; but every means is used to make instruction and study pleasant as well as profitable. It presents to parents, who have no good teacher of Languages in their neighborhood, great facilities for thoroughly preparing their sons for College. They can be placed in private families, where they will be taken care of; and every attention will be paid to their morals and deportment. Two well qualified teachers devote their whole time to the instruction of the Grammar School; and it is, besides, under the superintendance of one of the Faculty as a Rector, who spends in it one hour per day, in general supervision of the classes, and in minute inspection into the improvement of each pupil. No pains will be spared to enable children placed in the school to realize the expectations and hopes of their parents.

XII. LOCATION.

The College is pleasantly situated in the centre of the state, in Danville,* a healthy, quiet and retired village, where there are few temptations to seduce the young from their studies or allure them into vice. From its retired situation, from the healthiness and fertility of the adjacent country, and from the moral and religious character of its inhabitants, Danville possesses eminent natural advantages as a place for educating youth. These advantages have been improved, and there are now enjoyed here facilities for education of every kind. Besides the College Proper and Grammar School, there is, under the care of the Trustees, a Primary School, where a thorough Common English Education will be given to youth of all ages. There is also under the care of the Board, an Institution, handsomely endowed by Congress, for the education of the Deaf and Dumb—the only Institution of the kind in the South West. There is, further, in the village, a Female School of the highest order, under the care of a Teacher, (Rev. James K. Burch,) whose long experience and great success in the instruction of females, have extended his reputation far beyond the bounds of our own state. By order,

D. G. COWAN, *Secretary.*

Danville, March 20th, 1833.

* Danville lies at the distance of 10 miles from Harrodsburgh, on the road leading from the Harrodsburgh to the Crab Orchard Springs; and is thus conveniently located for persons from the South who may wish to spend their Summers where they can see their children.

MONTICELLO ACADEMY,

FOR MALES AND FEMALES.

THE Summer Session of this Institution will commence on the 29th of April, and continue twenty-one weeks.

The facilities to be afforded here, for acquiring a thorough education in the various departments of science and literature, are intended to be as extensive as at any similar institution in the West. The Academy is now undergoing some necessary repairs;—Globes, an Orrery and other apparatus will be immediately procured; which, added to the acknowledged health of the place, and the low expense incurred by a residence here, must render it a desirable situation for any who wish to obtain a good education. Applications should be made, if possible, previous to the commencement of the session. *All requisite books can be procured here, at a low price.*

TERMS.

Languages and Natural Philosophy, per session,	$12 50
Mathematics, Rhetoric and History,	10 00
Geography, Eng. Grammar, Arithmetic, Penmanship, &c.	8 00

☞ Tuition will be charged from the time of entrance to the end of the current session, which must be paid in *advance.*

T. C. TUPPER, *Principal.*

Monticello, March 15th, 1833.—37-6w.

The Hygeian Vegetable Universal Medicine of the British College of Health, London.

THE high reputation which this distinguished medicine has attained in the United States cannot be more clearly exemplified than by stating the fact that the Agent for Ohio, who resided last year at Cincinnati, sold upwards of $20,000 worth during the last 12 months. This medicine being composed only of vegetable matter, and warranted on oath as not containing one particle of mercurial or other mineral substance, is though entirely effective in its operation. The blood constitutes the life of man, and upon the purity of this vital source depends the health and happiness we are to enjoy in this world. The HYGEIAN MEDICINE has never failed if duly persevered in, and innumerable are the cures it has effected in consumptions, cholera morbus, inflammations internal or external, dyspepsia, fevers, ague, indigestion, billious and nervous affections, all diseases of the liver, yellow fever, gout, rheumatism, lumbago, tic-doloreux, dropsy, St. Vitus' dance, epilepsy, apoplexy, paralysis and palsy, feminine sickness, jaundice, scarlet fever, asthma, gravel, piles, strictures, scurvy, scrofula, and all cutaneous diseases.—A book recording many extraordinary cases of cure, can be referred to where this medicine is left for sale, at the store of Messrs. TILFORD & ANDERSON, Lexington Kentucky.

☞ Advice will be given *gratis*, by Mr. WHITE, Agent for Kentucky, and resident at Mr. Stedman's Lexington.

Price in boxes according to size, $1, $2, and $3 each, with directions.

Lex January 9—27-tf.

DOCTOR CHALLEN,

HAVING returned from Cincinnati, where he has been engaged in the practice of Medicine nearly six years—offers his services to the citizens of Lexington, and its vicinity, in the various departments of his profession.

Office near the corner of Main and Spring streets, adjoining the residence of his father, William Challen.

Nov. 21, 1832—21-tf.

NEW AUCTION
And Commission Store.

THE undersigned has commenced the above business, and will be ready to attend to sales either public or private, at his Auction room, on Main-street, opposite the Post-Office.

F. MONTMOLLIN.

Lexington, Ky. October 31, 1832—18-tf.

Shelby Female Academy.

THE next term of this institution will commence on MONDAY THE 11 h OF FEBRUARY.

Eight or ten scholars can be accommodated, on reasonable application.

Lexington, January 29th, 1833. 30-tf.

MERCHANT TAILORS'
FASHIONABLE STORE,

No. 2, Cheapside, Lexington.

WILLIAMS & WILSON,

ARE just receiving from New-York and Philadelphia, a new and splendid assortment of

FALL AND WINTER GOODS,

AMONG WHICH ARE,

Cloths, Cassimeres and Vestings,

Consisting of every variety of colour and quality, suitable for Gentlemen's dress and wear:—Also a beautiful assortment of Gloves, Cravats, Stocks, Suspenders, Socks, Shirt Buttons, Collars, fine ready made Linen, Flannel and Cotton Shirts and Drawers; Shirt Buttons, Guard Chains, Cloak Cords, Fur Collars, and many other articles. A few ready made Cloaks, Vests and Pantaloons of the best quality.

We return our thanks to our customers and the public, for their liberal patronage, and solicit them to call and examine for themselves. Our work shall be done in a style not inferior to any in the U. States. All orders from a distance will be gratefully received and promptly attended to.

Latest Fashions just received.

Employers wishing A. F. Saguez's patent system of cutting from New-York, can obtain it, as we are his agents; or a full report of fashions in figures and drawings quarterly.

October 31, 1832. 18—f.

NEW GOODS.

THE Subscriber has just received and opened at his Store, on Upper Street, near the Market House, a new and handsome assortment of

FALL AND WINTER GOODS,

Selected from Baltimore and Philadelphia—which he offers on moderate terms; among which are the following articles to wit:

Children's Shoes, assorted—Children's Dolls, assorted—Musical Harmonicans—Superior Blacking, by the dozen or box—Almonds, Raisins, Citron, Candies, Lickquorish, &c. &c.

Cash or country produce taken in exchange.

WILLIAM TUCKER.

Lexington, Ky. October 10 1832.—15-tf.

HATTING BUSINESS.
JOHN STEEL

RETURNS his thanks to the public, for the very liberal encouragement he has received from them, and in order to serve his friends and customers more promptly and better, he has taken into co-partnership with him, WILLIAM TOD, Jr. who will take charge of our Manufactory, personally. Mr. Tod has worked in most of the Eastern Cities, and made himself thoroughly acquainted with the latest improvements of the trade in all its branches. By our close application to business and great desire to give satisfaction, we hope to merit an increased share of public patronage. The business to be continued at the old stand at the corner of Main and Main cross-st. under the firm of

STEEL & TOD.

N. B. One or two Apprentices who can come well recommended, will be taken to learn the above business. S. & T.

Lexington, October, 31, 1832—18-1y.

NEW GROCERY
AND PLANK YARD.

JOHN SHROCK, has the pleasure of informing his friends and the public generally, that he has commenced the Grocery business, in connexion with a Plank Yard, formerly owned by Mr. B. Blunt. He has a first rate assortment of family Groceries, such as Tea, Coffee, Loaf, Lump and New-Orleans Sugar, Spices, Pepper, Lamp Oil, Fish, Molasses, Cheese, Nails, &c. &c.

Also: A general assortment of Planks, Scantling, and Cedar Posts, &c. all of which will be offered on as good terms as they can be had in Lexington. The establishments are placed under the management of J. S. Freeman; whose attention to business, he hopes will merit a share of public favor. The attention of the public is respectfully invited.

Lexington, October 24, 1832—17-tf.

THE WESTERN LUMINARY.

TERMS.

Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum, payable within the year.—*Two Dollars*, if paid in advance, or within the first six months.—*Three Dollars* after the expiration of the year.

☞ Arrearages must be paid before the paper can be discontinued.

☞ Persons procuring five new subscribers, and paying for them in advance, shall be entitled to a sixth copy gratis.

☞ All communications must be post paid, except letters from Agents remitting subscriptions.

☞ All Postmasters, who are so obliging as to act as Agents, shall have the paper sent to them without charge.

☞ Advertisements inserted the usual rates.